The Solicitors' Journal
and Weekly Reporter.
(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)
LONDON, FEBRUARY 1, 1919.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE: £2 12s.; by Post, £2 14s.; Foreign, £2 16s.
HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

*** The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.
All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

Cases Reported this Week.

Current Topics.

The Valuation of Land taken for Public Purposes.

WE PRINT elsewhere the summary of recommendations appended to the Second Report of Mr. LESLIE SCOTT'S Acquisition of Land Committee. This Report, as we have already noticed, deals with the valuation of land. The first Report dealt with the mode of obtaining compulsory powers. The two together furnish the basis for a very extensive remodelling of the Lands Clauses Act, 1845, and the mode in which the Legislature gives effect to this will be awaited with interest. An example of the adaptation of that Act to special conditions of acquisition is afforded by the Defence of the Realm (Acquisition of Land) Act, 1916. But to what extent new legislation of the Reconstruction type will make actual progress in the new Parliament is still a matter for the future.

The Peace Conference and the League of Nations.

THE OUTSTANDING result of the Peace Conference so far is the resolution in favour of a League of Nations, which definitely places that project in the forefront of the Peace Settlement. The resolution, which was moved by President WILSON and carried unanimously, was as follows:—

> The Conference, having considered proposals for the creation of a League of Nations, resolves that:—
> (*a*) It is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement which the Associated Nations are now met to establish that a League of Nations be created to promote international co-operation, to ensure the fulfilment of accepted international obligations, and to provide safeguards against war.
> (*b*) This League should be treated as an integral part of the general treaty of peace, and should be open to every civilized nation which can be relied on to promote its objects.
> (*c*) The members of the League should periodically meet in international conference, and should have a permanent organization and secretariat to carry on the business of the League in the intervals between the Conference. The Conference, therefore, appoints a committee representative of the Associated Governments to work out the details of the constitution and functions of the League.

The passing of the resolution is not equivalent to the overcoming of all the practical difficulties that lie in the way of the establishment of the League. But it is an earnest that no effort will be spared to overcome them, and that the leading statesmen of the day recognize that this way only lies the safety of civilization.

The Admission of Women.

THE ARTICLE by Mr. Justice RIDDELL, of the Supreme Court of Ontario, on "Women as Practitioners of Law," in the December number of the *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law* comes at an opportune time. It does not argue the question of the admission of women into the legal profession, but just gives the facts about that admission in Canada and the United States. The first attempt of a woman to enter the profession in Canada appears to have been that of Miss MARTIN in 1891, and it was rejected by the Benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada on the ground that they had no power to admit a woman. A distinction still exists in Canada between barristers and solicitors, though the same person may practise in both branches, and, in fact, most barristers are solicitors and *vice versa*. As a result of the decision of the Law Society the Legislature of Ontario first intervened to enable women to become solicitors and then barristers, and Miss MARTIN was admitted to both branches on 2nd February, 1897. Since that time, says Mr. Justice RIDDELL, there have been seven other women admitted as solicitors and called to the Bar, most of whom are practising. Three have married barristers, and one is practising with her husband. Mr. Justice RIDDELL makes the following comment on women as practitioners:—

> "The women who practise law are not 'wild women'; they are earnest, well-educated women, who ask for no favours, but are quite willing to do their share of the world's work on the same conditions as men.
>
> "While occasionally one of them has been known to take the brief at a trial, this is not usual; they generally retain counsel for such work and confine themselves to chamber practice. Occasionally a woman takes a court or chamber motion, but as a general rule her work is that of a solicitor. In my own experience, as in that of judicial brethren whom I have consulted, when she appears in court or chambers she conducts her case with dignity and propriety, exhibiting as much legal acumen, knowledge of the law, and sound sense as her masculine *confrère*, and she does not trade upon her sex."

The Results of Admission.

OF THE other nine Provinces of Canada, Quebec refuses admission to women, and in Prince Edward Island and the Yukon territory the question has not been raised. But in Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Saskatchewan they are admitted under either general or special legislation. But the whole number of women practising law in Canada is very small, perhaps a dozen in all. The numbers may be expected to increase, but not rapidly. Mr. Justice RIDDELL says:—

> "I do not think that the most fervent advocate of women's rights would claim that the admission of women to the practice of the law has had any appreciable effect on the Bar, the practice of the law, the Bench, or the people. It is claimed that it was a measure of justice and fair play, that it removed a grievance, and has had no countervailing disadvantage. That claim may fairly be allowed: in other respects the admission of women is regarded with complete indifference by all but those immediately concerned."

In the United States the results have been larger. Women have been admitted to practise before all the Federal Courts and all the State Courts, except those of Arkansas, South Carolina, and Virginia. Some 1,200 women have joined the profession, but here, again, their admission has not had any marked effect upon the Bar or the practice of law. "They have sustained a good reputation in their practice; no charge of impropriety, dishonesty, or unprofessional conduct has ever been laid against them so far as the Court records show"; and "the great body of the profession is beginning—has, indeed, progressed some distance on the way—to treat her as a desirable and useful part of the profession and the body politic." Such appear to be the facts on the other side of the Atlantic, but we should add the learned Judge's own summary:—

> "If I were to sum up in a sentence the results of the admission of women to the practice of the law from my experience and inquiry, I would say it has done some good and no harm, while all prophecies of ill results have been falsified; that its effects on the profession and practice of law have been negligible, and that it is now regarded with indifference and as the normal and natural thing by Bench, Bar, and the community at large."

We need not add any comment. Our own opinion of the inevitability of the change has been already expressed.

A Novel Action against a Solicitor.

A VERY unusual action, both as regards facts and law, was decided by McCARDIE, J., in the recent case of *Cubitt* v. *Gamble* (*Times*, 24th ult.). It was an action for trespass against a solicitor, and the trespass consisted in the issue of a writ of *fi. fa.* The plaintiff was one of three trustees of a will, the other two trustees being a widow and the defendant. The defendant as solicitor-trustee was entitled to make all the usual professional charges, and sent in his bill of costs to the trustees. The trustees obtained an order to tax, and as the amount taxed off was less than one-sixth, the defendant was entitled to the costs of taxation. The other two trustees thereupon sent to the defendant a cheque for a sum which included the amount of the bill and the costs of taxation. The defendant, however, contended that the other trustees ought personally to bear the costs of the taxation, and he returned the cheque, saying that he must have two separate cheques. Then without any warning the defendant issued a writ of *fi. fa.* for the costs of taxation, directed the sheriff to levy that amount upon the property of the plaintiff, and caused the sheriff's officer to go to the plaintiff's place of business and to seize his goods until the money was paid. Under these circumstances the learned Judge held, following the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Clissold* v. *Cratchley* (1910, 2 K. B. 244), that a person who issues an execution after the debt has been paid is liable to an action for trespass, and that the result is the same where there has been a valid tender, as he held there had been in the present case, and he accordingly awarded the plaintiff 200 guineas damages. The case is a curious and novel one, and somewhat of a surprise; but the decision can hardly be doubted, assuming that the tender was a valid one. On this point there may be some question. If the defendant's contention was correct, and we are not aware of any direct authority against it, the tender does not seem to have been a proper one. The point does not seem to have been expressly dealt with in the judgment, but perhaps a fuller report of the case may shew that it was.

The Right to Journalistic Anonymity.

A POINT of some practical interest has just been raised by Mr. Justice DARLING in *Cave* v. *Hulton & Sons* (*Limited*) (*Times*, 23rd ult.). Here Lord CAVE sued the defendants for a libel on him contained in the *Daily Sketch*. The words complained of imputed to Lord CAVE a neglect of the interests of British prisoners of war in Germany, and hinted at personal motives as the cause. The defendants offered an apology and a payment of £500 towards some Prisoners of War Fund to be selected by Lord CAVE. This offer was accepted, and the settlement was mentioned by counsel in open court in the usual way. Thereupon the trial judge, Mr. Justice DARLING, inquired whether steps had been taken to punish the actual writer of the libel, whose name, he said, had not been disclosed to Lord CAVE or the Court. Counsel for the defendants considered that it was no part of their duty to furnish the actual writer's name, since the proprietors had accepted responsibility and tendered compensation for his acts. The suggestion of Mr. Justice DARLING evidently was that, since libel is a criminal offence, where a settlement of the libel is arranged the name of the actual writer should be disclosed, so that the Court may be in a position to order a prosecution if it thinks fit. This is, indeed, the duty of the Court where a prosecution is withdrawn by the prosecutor. And where the plaintiff sues for a criminal offence which is also tortious, it is quite arguable that the Court should be in the same position as if he had taken criminal proceedings.

The Right to Trial by Jury.

THE RESTRICTION by the Juries Act, 1918, of the right to trial by jury has been accepted as one of the consequences of war conditions; whether it is to be restored to its original state after the war is a question that should be considered in the

light of modern views as to the conduct of legislation. The recent Act lays down as a general rule that trials shall be by a judge alone without a jury; but the right to a jury on the application of either party is retained in cases where fraud is alleged or where there is a claim for libel, slander, malicious prosecution, false imprisonment, seduction, or breach of promise of marriage; and an order may be made for a jury on the application of either party where the Court or a judge considers that the matter is more fit to be tried with, than without, a jury. There is also a reservation of the right to a jury under section 28 of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1857. It would appear from an article by a "Legal Correspondent" in the *Times* of 25th January that there is in some quarters an opinion that the pre-war practice in respect of juries should be restored as soon as possible, and the writer refers to various judicial opinions as to the advantage of obtaining the decision of a jury, and in particular to the feeling expressed by "a very learned judge" (who is not named) in the following terms:—

> "A judge is always embarrassed by the feeling that his decision more or less creates a precedent. He hankers after consistency. The ghosts of past decisions rise up before his mind, and cases yet to come cast their shadows before them. The jury are haunted by no such spectres. They meet together once for all to do justice to the particular parties in a particular case."

But when the matter comes up for consideration attention should be paid to the report of the Home Office Committee on the working of the jury system which was issued in 1913. The Committee were not unanimous, but the majority recommended a restriction of the right to a jury even stronger than that embodied in the recent Act. Save in cases of defamation, the Master (subject to an appeal to the Judge in Chambers) was to have an absolute discretion to decide whether a jury was necessary, unless both parties desired a jury. There is, of course, much to be said for the retention of juries in cases where personal character is concerned, but for ordinary commercial cases, and cases of rights in property, a judge sitting alone would seem to be the more satisfactory tribunal. The Juries Act, 1918, is to have effect "during the continuance of the present war and for a period of six months thereafter," so that it will come to an end automatically. But it might be better to prolong its operation until the question can be properly considered.

Action for Nervous Shock.

In the recent case of *Janvier* v. *Sweeney* (*Times*, 27th ult.), Avory, J., has just given an explanation of a much-discussed modern leading case, *Wilkinson* v. *Downton* (1897, 2 Q. B. 57), which really elucidates the principle on which that decision is founded. In *Wilkinson* v. *Downton* some facetious person with a peculiar sense of humour told a married woman, by way of a practical joke, that her husband had met with a serious accident. The woman suffered in consequence a serious nervous attack, followed by an illness. It was held that these facts constituted a good cause of action for trespass on the case. This decision, although frequently criticized, has been generally accepted as good law, but doubts as to the principle on which it rests have been freely expressed by learned judges and by text-book writers. The tort founded on is usually stated as being "any false statement made maliciously, which in fact causes injury to the person to whom it is made"; both Salmond and Pollock agree in regarding this as being the gist of the legal wrong. But the mere making of a false statement which causes injury is not *per se* actionable: *Allsop* v. *Allsop* (5 H. & N. 534); nor does it become actionable merely because of negligence on the part of the person who makes the statement: *Derry* v. *Peek* (14 App. Cas. 337). It is, therefore, the malicious nature of the false statement, and not its falsity, on which the action rests, and this has led text-book writers to regard malice as the cause of the tort. A malicious intent to injure another, provided the means used are not protected by one's own legal rights, is, therefore, set up as the essence of this tort. Now, this view is unsatisfactory on grounds of principle. For the essence of all torts is breach of the plaintiff's rights. Mere abuse of one's own legal powers is not *per se* breach of another person's rights, nor, on principle, actionable. To establish a tort one must shew that a right of the plaintiff, which it is everyone's legal duty not to infringe, has been violated by the defendant. Nor is breach of a right always enough; that depends on the character of the right violated. In some cases mere infringement is in itself actionable—*e.g.*, trespass to property or the person. In other cases there must be infringement *damage feasant*—*e.g.*, nuisance—where the right to infringe is the right to enjoy one's property. In others, again, there must be negligence, fraud, or malice proved. But in every case of an actionable tort which has stood the test of critical examination in modern reported decisions, there has existed some recognizable legal right of the plaintiff which has been infringed. And the unsatisfactory character of *Wilkinson* v. *Downton* (*supra*), as usually stated, has been the lack of any such definite and recognizable legal right.

Terror as a Cause of Action.

The earlier cases, indeed, went on a rather obviously false view of the principle involved. Attention was concentrated on the malicious or negligent character of the act committed by the defendant, coupled with the terror caused to the plaintiff. This is seen clearly in *Dulieu* v. *White* (1901, 2 K. B. 669), where a barmaid recovered damages for a nervous shock occasioned her by her terror at the sight of a pair-horse van entering the bar as the result of the defendant's servant's reckless driving. The Court evidently regarded the gist of the tort there as the causing of terror, without lawful excuse, to one of the King's liege subjects. It is true that Mr. Justice Phillimore (see p. 685) quoted with approval a remark of Mr. Justice Wright's in *Wilkinson* v. *Downton* (*supra*), to the effect that everyone has a legal right to his personal safety, and that the breach of this right by unjustifiable means is tortious. But, having said this, the learned Judge immediately went on to overlook the breach of right, and quoted a number of analogous cases to shew that "terror wrongfully induced and causing physical mischief" is a source of wrong. The result is that the inducement of terror, followed by damage, became tacitly recognized as the basis of the tort. And this tendency was increased by the fact that it was chiefly in trade union cases, where picketing or other coercion had ruined a man's business, that the case was quoted and its principle invoked.

The Legal Right to Personal Safety.

It has been reserved for Mr. Justice Avory at last to restore the true principle as laid down by Wright and Phillimore, JJ., respectively, in the earlier cases quoted above. Now, Mr. Justice Avory's case, *Janvier* v. *Sweeney* (*supra*), was one of peculiar difficulty. The agent of a private detective had called on a woman whose fiancé was a German interned in the Isle of Man, had falsely pretended that he was a detective inspector from Scotland Yard, authorized by the military authorities to take the action he was taking, and had told her she was wanted for corresponding with a German spy. This statement was not made maliciously, to injure the plaintiff, nor yet as a practical joke; the agent adopted it as a ruse to get certain information which he believed to be wanted by his employers. But the poor woman not unnaturally had a fright which caused serious illness, and for this she sued. The ground of action was rightly, in our opinion, described by Mr. Justice Avory in a luminous judgment as the "wilful breach of a person's right to personal safety." The gist of the tort, then, is this: There exists a right, that of personal safety, in every individual. Intentionally to violate this right without lawful excuse is a wrong, whether there be malice or negligence, or not. This wrong becomes actionable when followed by damage which is not too remote. Here, the right was violated by the attempt to frighten and intimidate the woman. And no lawful excuse for the attempt existed, especially as the instrument of terror was a deliberate falsehood. Reasonable and probable damage followed; hence the *injuria* became completed by *damnum*.

Declaratory Judgments.

It is now well settled practice in this country to obtain judgments declaratory of rights without at the same time asking for or getting consequential relief. The practice was introduced in Chancery by the Court of Chancery Act, 1852, s. 50, and was extended in scope and applied to all courts under the Judicature Acts. It is now embodied in R.S.C., ord. 25, r. 5, which provides that "No action or proceeding shall be open to objection on the ground that a merely declaratory judgment or order is sought thereby, and the Court may make binding declarations of right whether any consequential relief is or could be claimed or not." A well-known instance of such orders is afforded by the Land Valuation cases of *Dyson* v. *Attorney-General* (1912, 1 Ch. 158) and *Burghes* v. *Attorney-General* (1912, 1 Ch. 173), and more generally in *Guaranty Trust Co. of New York* v. *Hannay & Co.* (1915, 2 K. B. 536). Of the same nature are declarations as to the construction of documents made under R.S.C., ord. 54A, r. 1. But it appears that the United States have not yet made any such provision in their procedure. The *Central Law Journal* for 3rd January last contains the address delivered at the meeting last June of the Michigan State Bar Association by Mr. Edson R. Sutherland, in which the whole subject is discussed with reference to English and American practice, and it is pointed out that England has far surpassed the States in devising remedial methods calculated to make the courts useful and available under the exacting requirements of modern civilization. Declaratory orders are, indeed, the natural result of the "reign of law." At the back of the decrees of the Courts there is the force of the State, and this sanction is ready for use if necessary. But in practice it is less and less wanted, and rights when ascertained are respected without recourse to physical force. This is the principle at the root of declaratory orders. In America a person who wishes to obtain a forecast of his rights has to consult his lawyer, and there the matter stops. With us the lawyer can, in a suitable case, get the opinion of the Court. It is necessary to insert this qualification, for it is, under ord. 25, r. 5, discretionary with the Court whether to make the order or not, and the Court is not over ready to exercise the discretion in favour of making the order, though Mr. Sunderland says that an examination of the Reports, 1916, 2 Ch., shews that, out of sixty-four cases reported, forty-three were brought for declarations of right. An editorial note to his address suggests that the introduction of declaratory orders will probably be the next important reform in the administration of justice in the United States.

An Old-time American Lawyer.

The career of the late Joseph H. Choate is familiar through his residence in this country as United States Ambassador from 1899 to 1905, and his premier position as an advocate has been emphasized by Mr. Theron G. Strong's book on him which we have already noticed (62 Solicitors' Journal, 615; see also *ibid.*, p. 19); but not the least interesting part of that book is the account it contains of Mr. Southmayd, one of the partners in Mr. Choate's firm. That firm has had a long history. Founded by J. Prescott Hall, a former Attorney-General of New York State, it became Hall & Butler, then Hall, Butler & Evarts, and in 1857 Butler, Evarts & Southmayd, then later Evarts, Southmayd & Choate. The further changes of the last sixty years we need not follow. Our present concern is with Mr. Southmayd. At twelve and a half he had learned all his schoolmaster could teach him, and appears to have gone at once into a law office. He soon, it seems, knew all that was to be got from the scantier reports and books of those days, and while yet a boy was known in the office as "The Chancellor." His conduct of a case as an opponent of Butler & Evarts excited such admiration that he was, as just stated, taken into partnership with them, and until he retired in 1884 at the age of sixty he was the mainstay of the firm's business. His practice was in advising and drafting, and he rarely took a case in court, but in his own sphere he was *facile princeps*, and clients at all hours flocked about him for advice. Matthew Arnold, during a visit to the States, made his acquaintance, and said he reminded him of an old-fashioned English solicitor dug out of Dickens or Trollope or Thackeray—happily, the great critic lived before the days of Mr. H. G. Wells—and he appears to have been a first-rate specimen of the lawyer, entirely immersed in the law. He never married, and outside the law had almost no interests. The more singular was his retirement at sixty. He lived till nearly eighty-seven, and this long evening of life was filled with a lawyer's eccentricities. It is enough to mention one. He was always afraid of being caught in some legal trap. He had a carriage and horses, but preferred to hire a cab. His reason was in the maxim, *Respondeat superior*. "If I have a cab and an accident happens, I incur no liability. That falls upon the owner." Of course, he could not tolerate motors, and never rode in an automobile. What he would have said to aeroplanes can be guessed. But more useful, if somewhat extreme, was his saying that every young lawyer should lay aside all his professional income. To the objection, "But the man must live," he had the answer, "If he will only follow my rule, he will soon be able to live upon the income of his income." Mr. Southmayd's greatest exploit was when he emerged from his retirement to engineer the successful attack on the validity of the Income Tax Act—which tempts us to say, Oh, for a Southmayd here!

Lord Halsbury in 1905.

By Christian Tearle.

On a certain day in March, 1905, the public gallery of Appeal Court II. was fuller than usual, and the body of the court was crowded with members of both branches of the profession. There was nothing in the paper to attract such a throng; they were there to see something which in the days of "Bleak House" was one of the sights of London: the Lord High Chancellor sitting in state, with the mace below him and the purse behind his chair, and a gentleman, or two, in court dress hovering about the background. Lord Justice Romer was ill, and Lord Halsbury had come forward to fill the gap.

When the following sketch was written, thirteen years ago, etiquette forbade that it should be printed, but the honest description of a great judge as he appeared to his contemporaries, no matter what its defects may be, is a small contribution to legal history, and, therefore, now that Lord Halsbury is no longer a dispenser of patronage and some of the other lawyers mentioned have passed away, there is no reason why the proceedings of the day in question should not be put on record. Notwithstanding the lapse of time, the writer thinks it better to offer in the present tense the impressions set forth below, that being the form in which they were written:—

No one can sit and watch Lord Halsbury without being struck by two things—his mastery of his business and his wonderful freshness. During counsel's opening he lies back, his chin upon his breast, and he listens with rapt attention. When a document is referred to he spreads his copy upon the desk before him and, clapping on a pair of tortoiseshell eyeglasses, he follows counsel's reading with minute care. He rarely interrupts to ask a question until the facts have been fully stated; then he makes straight for the core of the dispute, and he tries to clear the ground by ascertaining how far it is admitted that the main point comes within some well-known rule of law. "Assuming the facts of this case to be so and so," says he, stating them with delightful terseness, "do you admit that such-and-such a principle applies?"

Many counsel are apt to fence when the Court puts a question like this. Only a lawyer who is a master of his calling can take such a bird's-eye view of his whole case as to enable him to form a clear estimate of the relative importance of its parts, and, unless a man is quite sure as to what is substance and what is fringe, he cannot, and dare not, answer with a "Yes" or "No." If he fences, some judges will press and badger him until the hearing degenerates into a wrangle between Bench and Bar, but this is not the Chancellor's way. Should counsel prefer to evade the question, Lord Halsbury

does not press it, and the advocate continues his argument undisturbed.

To-day, however, there is no fencing or evasion. "Yes, my Lord" is the prompt answer of Mr. NEVILLE, the appellant's counsel.

It is sometimes a matter of lament among old Chancery hands that there has been no Chancery Chancellor since Lord SELBORNE; but, except as regards the patronage of the Great Seal—a subject outside the scope of the present article—this lament is merely sentimental. Chancery judges of first instance and their subordinates must of necessity be well versed in the practice; but Lord HALSBURY, Lord HERSCHELL and several Lords Justices have proved that under our present system of judicature no special equity training is necessary to enable a lawyer of the higher rank to grapple successfully with all such equity questions as come before a Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, it is a little startling to find that Lord HALSBURY is very much at his ease and complete master of his Court when a question of the marshalling of assets comes under discussion. This doctrine is a child of pure equity, but he handles it with the ease and certainty which he was shewing an hour or two earlier, when the Court had to decide whether a lessor had or had not derogated from his own grant.

As one watches the Chancellor, and notes how firm he is, notwithstanding all his patience and courtesy, and how fully he is endowed with a sense of humour, one cannot help feeling sorry for those vehement practitioners who are clamouring for an immediate inquiry into the Land Transfer Act. This at least is certain—Lord HALSBURY is not a man to be bullied or driven, and he has a pretty ample knowledge of human nature. "Breach of faith! Breach of faith!" is the cry. "You promised an inquiry, and in the sacred interests of our clients, nay, of the whole country, we demand that inquiry now!" The old gentleman sits tight. Perhaps he closes one eye. "*Costs, costs, costs!*" says he to himself.

Any tribunal of which the Lord Chancellor forms a part has a special character of its own. The mere fact that he is the head of the law adds to the Court's dignity, and the knowledge that many things are in his gift is an incentive to counsel to put forth all their powers. But the man himself is an object of interest, quite apart from his office. He comes before us not only as the highest of the judges, but as one of the rulers of the country. He brings with him a breath of that great world to which most lawyers are strangers. For thirty years Lord HALSBURY has been in touch with the inner working of the government machine. He has told us quite recently that as a Law Officer he often attended the meetings of Lord BEACONSFIELD'S Cabinet, and we know that it is twenty years since he first held the Great Seal. And behind all this span of official life stretches a long and distinguished career at the Bar.

It is interesting to watch him sitting with his two brother judges in the serene atmosphere of the Court of Appeal and applying all his faculties to the legal problems under discussion, and to think of him as Lord BEACONSFIELD'S Solicitor-General and Lord SALISBURY'S Chancellor and friend. He is all judge for the time being, but those eyes which are now fixed upon some document of little moment were scanning State papers before the Treaty of Berlin was made. As one gazes at him, and recalls some of the history which he has helped to make, it seems impossible that the elderly gentleman in the middle chair can have gone through so much.

The massive face tells of health and strength unbroken, and just now his eyes are twinkling, as in neat and caustic phrases Mr. NEVILLE satirises the judgment of the Court below.

"I submit, my Lord, that, however valuable this judgment may be as a series of general propositions, it has no bearing upon the subject-matter of the action," urges the speaker, and he goes on to cite a further passage or two. Lord HALSBURY is evidently impressed, and, though the Court has already heard the judgment from beginning to end, he wishes to study it in the light of Mr. NEVILLE'S veiled sarcasms. Motioning to him to pause, the Chancellor takes up a copy, and with knitted brow he reads steadily through the material part of it, counsel watching him meanwhile, with an air which is decidedly confident.

A single perusal is not enough. For a second time the judge's eye travels slowly down the page, and then—like one who has grappled with a riddle and feels that he must give it up—he sinks back into his chair. "I confess I cannot follow what my brother KEKEWICH had in his mind," he says, as if to himself.

The judgment has proved unintelligible to his lordship, but—courteous always—he speaks as if his own obtuseness were at fault. It is, however, manifest to all that the appellant has won.

There may be two opinions as to Lord HALSBURY'S merits as a legislator, and the wisdom of some of his judicial appointments may be open to question, but among lawyers there is only one opinion as to his merits as a judge. "Though I care not what they say of me as a political character," wrote Lord ELDON, "I am very nice and touchy about my judicial fame." If the present holder of the Great Seal be of the like mind, he has reason to be well content.

The mere physical vigour of the Lord Chancellor is a thing to marvel over. "Every year of health and activity after seventy is a gift of the gods" was a saying of Lord BEACONSFIELD, his old chief, and, remembering that the occupant of the middle chair was seventy-nine last September, no one who is familiar with JOHNSON'S lines can fail to echo them—

"His frame was firm, his powers were bright,
Though now his eightieth year was nigh."

The day's work does not end when the Court rises; the president must hie him to Westminster and take his seat upon the Woolsack. "He's a wonderful old gentleman," says one of the policemen on duty in the Strand, as he watches the carriage drive away westward; "he jumped out this morning just like a boy."

Laws and Proclamations of the German Provisional Governments.

By CHARLES HENRY HUBERICH, J.U.D., D.C.L., LL.D., of the United States Supreme Court Bar; and RICHARD KING, Solicitor of the Supreme Court, London.

(*Continued from page* 225.)

III.

ABOLITION OF CENSORSHIP, &c.

The censorship of postal and telegraphic communications is abrogated by an ordinance of 15th November, 1918[1]:—

> The Imperial Government decrees with the force of law the following:—
>
> Section 1.—The censorship of postal and telegraphic communications with foreign countries will be maintained hereafter in so far as the supervision is necessary in the interest of taxation or on economic grounds. The censorship may not be extended to include military or political matters.
>
> Section 2.—The censorship bureaus heretofore established remain in operation in order to carry out the purposes set forth in section 1, sentence 1, and are placed under the control of the Imperial Ministry of Finance.
>
> Berlin, 15th November, 1918.
>
> EBERT, HAASE.

A radical change in the military administration is made by a decree of 15th November, 1918[2]:—

> In order to secure a unified control over demobilization, a change in the relations of the military commands is necessary. The Acting General Commands, the General Staff, and the Supreme Military Administration are hereafter placed under the control of the Ministry for War. All military bureaus must comply with the orders of the Ministry. The Ministry for War, as well as all Imperial bureaus, are under the control of the Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council.
>
> Berlin, 15th November, 1918.
>
> The Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council.
>
> MOLKENBUHR, RICHARD MULLER.

1 Official Gazette, 16th November, 1918.
2 Official Gazette, 16th November, 1918.

In order to reassure the people in regard to the future action of the government, the following proclamation was issued under date of 15th November, 1918[3]:—

PROCLAMATION.

In order to refute the rumours that are in circulation, the Imperial Government makes the following declaration:—

1. We do not intend to seize deposits in banks or savings banks, or moneys, bank notes or securities on hand, or any open or sealed deposits.

2. We do not intend to declare the subscriptions to the Ninth War Loan, or to any War Loan, to be invalid or to affect the legal validity thereof. The Government, however, contemplates regorously calling upon the possessors of large fortunes and income to cover Governmental expenditures.

3. The claims for salaries, pensions and other claims in favour of public officials and employees and of the officers and other persons belonging to the military class, of persons incapacitated by war, and the dependents of such persons remain absolutely unaffected and continue in force.

Berlin, 15th November, 1918.

The Council of People's Commissioners,
EBERT, HAASE.

The Chief of Police also published a proclamation in the Official Gazette of 16th November, 1918, assuring the people that the laws remain in force and that the people should not allow themselves to be intimidated, as no one is entitled to attack private property. "All such violations will be punished in the most severe manner by the courts: extortion and looting will be prevented, if necessary, by immediate shooting of the offender."

CHANGE TO PEACE INDUSTRIES, &c.

On 21st November, 1918, the Imperial Bureau for Economic Demobilization decreed[4] that all unproductive labour on war work must cease, and that industries must begin immediately to take up peace work:—

Unproductive labour on war orders must cease. Industries must immediately be changed over for the manufacture of peace materials. For this purpose all state and communal authorities, public corporations, &c., shall immediately give their peace orders. Orders for public emergency work will be given. If sufficient orders are not on hand, peace work is to be manufactured for future disposal. Public authorities shall not make any further demands for the manufacture of war materials under existing contracts. For the purpose of satisfying at the earliest possible moment the peace needs of the country, the owners of industrial establishments must not insist on the right to deliver war materials to be manufactured hereafter. All peace orders are unconditionally to have the preference over current war orders. Dismissal of employees may take place only if provision has been made for work in other places. Unemployment is to be avoided under all circumstances.

If in exceptional cases the goal—peace work without unemployment—cannot be attained, war work may be provisionally continued as emergency work. In estimating compensation it is fundamental that no profits can be allowed on such work because of its character as emergency work.

Under authority of the decree of the Council of People's Commissioners, dated 12th November, 1918, relating to the establishment of an Imperial Bureau for Economic Demobilization (Demobilization Bureau), it is hereby decreed:

1. In so far as under exceptional circumstances war work must be continued after 10th November 1918, the public authorities having control of such work shall fix new prices for a continuance of work on war materials, taking into consideration its character as emergency work.

From the decision fixing the price an appeal lies in favour of the contractor or sub-contractor to the commissioner for demobilization of the district, and must be brought within four weeks after notification of the decision. The commissioner for demobilization, after hearing the public authorities and the appellants, shall finally fix the price, with the proviso that after compensation for the entire cost of production no profit shall be allowed, and that under no circumstances may the contract price be exceeded in whole or in part.

2. The contractors and sub-contractors have no right of action against a person giving the orders for any loss of profits on war contracts not carried out.

3. The foregoing provisions do not preclude an agreement concerning the immediate termination of the contracts, or of parts thereof, entered into between the public authorities and the contractor or sub-contractor, and providing in appropriate cases for the taking over of unfinished products.

4. In cases of doubt regarding the application of this ordinance in a particular case, the Demobilization Bureau shall decide on petition of any one of the parties.

5. The State Central Authorities, or the persons designated by them, shall designate the officials who are to assist the commissioners for demobilization in carrying out the duties set forth in section 1. The proceedings before the commissioner for demobilization are free of costs; the commissioner for demobilization decides as regards cash expenditures.

6. The ordinary jurisdiction of courts is excluded in controversies arising under this ordinance.

Berlin, 21st November, 1918.

Imperial Bureau for Economic Demobilization,
KOETH.

The Bundesrat was empowered to continue to exercise its administrative functions by an ordnance of 14th November, 1918[5]:—

Section 1.—The Bundesrat is empowered to continue to exercise the administrative functions entrusted to it under the laws and ordinances of the Empire.

Section 2.—This Ordinance has the force of law, and comes into operation upon its promulgation.

The Council of People's Commissioners,
EBERT, HAASE.

The Ministry of State for the Interior.
As Substitute: Dr. LEWALD.

The laws in reference to insuring the payment of war taxes were continued in force by the ordinance of 15th November, 1918[6]:—

The Imperial Government decrees with the force of law the following:—

Section 1.—The provisions contained in section 2 and the following of the law relating to securing the payment of war taxes of 9th April, 1917 (Bulletin of Laws, page 301), are extended to the fifth war year, with the limitation that companies shall reserve 80 per cent. of the excess profits of the fifth war year.

Section 2.—This ordinance comes into effect on the date of its promulgation.

Berlin, 15th November, 1918.

POSITION OF BERLIN COUNCIL.

A statement of the inter-relations of the various organs of government is contained in a telegram of the Imperial Government, signed by EBERT and HAASE, and addressed to the Soldiers' Councils of Leipzig, Dresden and Chemnitz[7]:—

The Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils are recognized by the Government as the bearers of the revolutionary will of the people and as a Board of Control over the entire administration of their respective districts. It must, however, be pointed out that an immediate interference in the administration of the technical bureaus is not permitted, because otherwise a lack of order and an imperiling of the common weal would result.

A more complete official statement of the relation of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils to the Imperial Government is contained in the Official Gazette of 23rd November, 1918 (Non-official part.):—

The revolution has created a new public law. For the present period of transition the new legal system is set forth in the following agreement between the Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council of Greater Berlin and the Council of People's Commissioners:—

1. All political power is vested in the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of the German Socialistic Republic. Their duty is to maintain and upbuild the results of the revolution and to repress the counter-revolution.

2. Until the assembly of the delegates to the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils has elected an Executive Committee of the German Republic, the Berlin Executive Committee exercises the functions of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of the German Republic, acting in concert with the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Greater Berlin.

3. The appointment of the Council of People's Commissioners by the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Greater Berlin means the transfer of the executive power of the Republic.

4. The appointment and dismissal of members of the Decisory Cabinet of the Republic (and until a final adjustment of State affairs also of Prussia) is vested in the Central Executive Committee, in which is also placed the right of control.

5. The Executive Committee is to be consulted in reference to the appointment by the Cabinet of technical heads of ministries.

A storm of protest arose in various parts of Germany, notably in Bavaria and Hesse, against this assumption of power by the Berlin Council, and the Official Gazette of 22nd November, 1918 (non-official part), contained the following:—

The Government of Hesse vigorously protests against the action

3 Official Gazette, 16th November, 1918.
4 Official Gazette, 22nd November, 1918.
5 Official Gazette, 16th November, 1918.
6 Official Gazette, 16th November, 1918.
7 Official Gazette, 21st November, 1918.

of the Imperial Government in failing to recognize the individual States in the making of laws and ordinances. The Government of Hesse demands that under all circumstances there be an immediate convening of the National Assembly. . . . We do not desire that in place of the Prussian military autocracy, now happily, destroyed, there should arise an arbitrary Prussian dictatorship.

The communication of the government of Hesse was answered by EBERT in the following terms[8]:—

By extending an invitation to the several States to a conference in Berlin the Imperial Government has shown that it does not desire to eliminate the separate States, but, on the contrary, regards their co-operation in the restoration of the Empire as essential. The Imperial Government regards the National Assembly as the most important means for attaining this end. The Imperial Government does not seek to establish the dictatorship of a city or of a federal State, but only the solidary democracy of a unified Germany.

The legal position of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Greater Berlin is set forth in a manifesto of 23rd November, 1918[9]:—

To the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Germany.

Companions and Comrades!

A fortnight ago you opened a pathway to freedom. Your bravery and your revolutionary strength has destroyed the old régime, the military dictatorship and mediæval monarchism.

It now devolves upon you to gather the fruits of the revolution. It is necessary now to repress the forces of the counter-revolutionaries, who, after their first terror, are creeping forth from their hiding places.

The Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Greater Berlin in the storm and stress of the first days of the revolution regards it as its task to create a Government of People's Commissioners to undertake the direction and administration in the new form of State in Germany and Prussia. The Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Greater Berlin does not assume to exercise any dictatorial powers over the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Germany. On the contrary, it believes that only by means of a close co-operation of all German Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils can the gains of the revolution be rendered secure. Distrust and misunderstandings are threatening to drive a wedge into the structure of the German Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils. Efforts are being made to split up the Imperial territory and to re-establish in a new form the miserable mediæval system of small States. In order to realize the great democratic and socialistic ends it is necessary to maintain a great German economic and linguistic territory. The Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Greater Berlin does not desire hostile separation between the North and the South. It desires that a free Germany shall be able to master the difficulties connected with the conclusion of peace; it desires that the demobilization shall be carried on in an orderly fashion, and that the dangers threatening the food supply of the people shall be overcome without friction.

The problems can be solved only by a harmonious combination of all Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of Germany. The activities exercised heretofore by the Executive Councils of Greater Berlin are provisional only, and are to be placed on a broader foundation as rapidly as possible. Until a legislative assembly has determined upon the constitution and arrangements of Republican Germany the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils must express the will of the German People.

We therefore call upon you to attend an assembly of delegates at Berlin. Quick action is necessary. It is therefore impossible to propose a uniform and general system of elections. We recommend that delegates be elected by the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils now existing, and that they be sent to Berlin. The assembly of delegates, in order to be capable of carrying on its work, should not exceed 500 members. Upon the basis of the census of 1910 this means one delegate for each 200,000 of population. In the case of larger army units one delegate is to be elected for each 100,000 men.

In order to reach a quick result the elections must be made on a territorial basis. We recommend that in the election the proportions of the workmen and soldiers represented in the district be taken into consideration.

We suggest that the assembly of delegates convene not later than Monday, 16th December of the current year, in the Assembly Room of the Prussian Houses of Parliament in Berlin. The work of the assembly will consist in the election of the Provisional Central Council of German Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils to determine upon a system of elections applicable to all German Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils, to determine the future legislative assembly, and to express its views in reference to other political questions.

Companions! Comrades! Let us act promptly and in common accord. Accept our proposal and hold the elections as quickly as possible. You have brought forth the revolution. Let us enjoy its fruits in common. The exact determination of the basis of election will be published immediately.

Berlin, 23rd November, 1918.

The Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council of Greater Berlin.

RICHARD MULLER, MOLKENBUHR.

For the East Front,

BERGMANN, GEORG MAIER, SAAR.

On the same day the Executive Committee issued a proclamation to the effect that its membership would be enlarged to include representatives from other portions of the Empire who are to be given full powers where Imperial interests are involved[10]:—

PROCLAMATION.

The Executive Committee of the Berlin Workmen's and Soldiers' Council is to be enlarged by the addition of members from the Empire to be elected by the representatives of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils of the non-Prussian Federal States, who will assist in the determination of matters provisionally in the hands of the Berlin Council and affecting the whole territory of the Republic. The further regulations regarding the election of delegates and their allotment to the several States are to be determined by the conference of the delegates of the Federal States already convoked.

Berlin, 23rd November, 1918.

The Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council of Greater Berlin.

RICHARD MULLER, MOLKENBUHR.

The apportionment of representation was made in a proclamation of 25th November, 1918.[11] The total number of delegates to the Assembly convened for 16th December was 412, of whom 42 were to be elected by the larger army units. The remaining 370 were apportioned to the various States on the basis of population, but in such manner that each Federal State had at least one representative. Of the larger representations may be mentioned the following:—Saxony (28), Dusseldorf (19), Province of Hanover (18), Berlin, including the districts of Tetlow, Beeskow and Lower Barnim (17), Arnsberg (14), Oppeln (13), Wurttemberg (13), Baden (11), Potsdam (11), Breslau (11), Hesse (8).[12]

(To be concluded.)

A 17th Century Monk's Conception of a League of Nations.

AT the present moment the subject in everyone's mind is the League of Nations. It is not intended in this article to consider whether universal peace is a possibility or merely a utopia, but to give some account of a man whose name is very little known, but who, nearly three centuries ago, had foreseen the possibility of a legal means of securing such peace, and who had drafted a plan in those far-away times for setting up a conference at Venice not so very unlike the Hague Conferences of our time. This man was EMERIC CRUCE, a monk, and for the information we have of him we are indebted for the most part to MR. THOMAS WILLING BALCH, a member of the Bar of Philadelphia known far beyond his State or country as an international jurist who has published as a portly volume CRUCE'S work, the "New Cyneas." In MR. BALCH'S book we find the original text of CRUCE in mediæval French, sometimes without accents, and on the opposite page is a translation by MR. BALCH and his sister. The editor modestly observes that his work will only interest scholars. Possibly this was a correct statement a decade or so ago when MR. BALCH'S book saw light, but many things have happened and great changes have taken place since then, possibly to be followed by still greater; so this imparts especial interest in CRUCE'S work at the present moment.

CRUCE was as one born out of due season, and he was far in advance of his epoch. His views are such that, had the attention of the Inquisition been directed to them, it is problematical if even the three known existing copies would be extant, to say nothing of the fate of the author. On the other hand, CRUCE'S views would have been as little acceptable to CALVIN, and had he found himself at Geneva in CALVIN'S days the lake city might have had the honour of burning him, as it had of performing that office for

[8] Official Gazette, 25th November, 1918.

[9] Official Gazette, 25th November, 1918.

[10] Official Gazette, 25th November, 1918.

[11] Official Gazette, 28th November, 1918.

[12] The electoral districts are not always co-terminus with the city or other political sub-division whose name they bear.

SERVETUS. Two examples from his work will prove these assertions: "The faults of the will are punishable by the civil law; those of knowledge—to wit, false doctrine—have only God for their Judge," and "LUTHER and CALVIN with their speech and writing have made a mess of things."

The reason why the work is entitled "Le Nouveau Cynée" will be found on turning to LANGHORNE'S translation of PLUTARCH'S life of PYRRHUS. The period was when the Tarentines invited PYRRHUS to come to their aid. Says PLUTARCH: "There was then at the court of PYRRHUS a Thessalonian named CYNEAS, a man of sound sense, and who, having been a disciple of DEMOSTHENES, was the only orator of his time that presented his hearers with a lively image of the force and spirit of the great master. This man had devoted himself to PYRRHUS, and in all the embassies he was employed in confirmed that saying of EURIPIDES, 'The gates that steel exclude, resistless eloquence shall enter.' Which made PYRRHUS say 'that CYNEAS had gained him more cities by his address than he had won with his arms.'" CYNEAS being thus on good terms with PYRRHUS, the former resolved to speak to his master about his Italian venture. PYRRHUS, like the Kaiser, explained that he was going to establish universal peace after sanguinary victories, when they would take their ease, eat, drink and be merry. To this CYNEAS replied: "And what hinders us from drinking and taking our ease now, when we have already these things in our hands, at which we propose to arrive through seas of blood, through infinite toils and dangers, through innumerable calamities which we must both cause and suffer?"

Three copies of CRUCE'S work are known; two are in the Bibliothèque nationale of Paris, bearing dates respectively 1623 and 1624, while the third copy, minus the title-page, is in the library at Harvard among the SUMNER collection, Mr. CHARLES SUMNER having picked up the work on a bookstall in Paris. CHARLES SUMNER, it may be parenthetically observed, was a friend of BROUGHAM, who presented him with the wig which he wore in the House of Lords during the Reform Bill debates. The wig found its way to Harvard, but there it was treated with less respect than Le Nouveau Cynée. It was used in amateur theatricals, and then for a time lost sight of. When it reappeared it was almost past recognition by the treatment and neglect which it had suffered. the original title is "Le Nouveau Cynée ou Discours d'Estat representant les occasions et Moyens d'establir une paix generale, et la liberté du commerce par tout le monde. Aux Monarques et Princes souverains de ce temps. Em. Cr. Par. A Paris chez Jacques Villery au Palais, sur le perron royal. MDCXXIII. Ave. Privilège du Roy." For just three centuries the true name of the author was unknown, but the work was attributed to EMERIC or EMERY DE LA CROIX. It was in 1890 that the exact name was discovered, and this was due to the researches of Mr. Justice NYS, of the Appeal Court of Brussels, who established that the real name of the author was CRUCE. Mr. Justice NYS, it may be observed, is the author of an exhaustive treatise on international law. Very little is known of CRUCE beyond that he was born in 1590 and died in 1648, that he was the author of the "New Cyneas," and that he published several works in Latin. Among the terms of opprobrium applied to CRUCE was Mercurius—equivocal to say the least, for, as CRUCE himself says, it designs the patron of theft or fecundity. That the insinuation was theft there can be little doubt, seeing that CRUCE in no measured terms condemned pluralists and advocated the application of the superfluous revenues of rich benefices to those which were less favourably situated, even, if proper, devoting them to the laity.

As to the author's views, he argued that it was for the advantage of society that the various powers and nationalities should not seek to injure and destroy one another by war, but rather to exchange their various products. Seeking the causes of foreign war, CRUCE makes them to be four; they are undertaken "either for honour or profit, or the reparation of some wrong, or else for exercise. One could add religion if experience had not made known that it serves most often for a pretext" (pp. 19, 20). "There is more dishonour to fear than glory to hope for in war, as the lives of several kings have shown" (p. 26). The military caste being impatient of quiet, some few kings licensed their subjects to seek fortune "for fear they should imitate the ancient Odrysae, who cut their own bodies with sword strokes when they had no enemy to fight. The Germans with the same aim trained their youths in brigandage. in order to occupy their time. What, then, will so many valiant men do to-day, who can only smell cannon powder, or place their hand on the hilt of the sword, or their foot except on a battlefield or a breach, as says a brave discourser who does not name himself? The answer to this question is brief. The world is not made for such people, who only know how to do harm. The court of kings is not their true abode. They should all be sent to the cannibals and savages, who have nothing of the man but the face" (pp. 42-44).

Coming to his plan whereby all nations may live in peace, we find CRUCE advocating just three centuries ahead of his time the establishment of a permanent "Hague" Conference in Venice—or perhaps it should be termed a permanent court of arbitration. In fact, his proposal was the creation of a League of Nations. CRUCE writes: "It would be necessary to choose a city, where all sovereigns should have perpetually their ambassadors, in order that the differences that might arise should be settled by the judgment of the whole assembly. The ambassadors of those who would be interested would plead the grievances of their masters, and the other deputies would judge them without prejudice. And to give more authority to the judgment, one would take the advice of the big republics, who would have likewise their agents at the same place. I say the great republics, like those of the Venetians or the Swiss, and not those small lordships, that cannot maintain themselves, and depend upon the protection of another. Then if anyone rebelled against the decrees of so notable a company, he would receive the disgrace of all other Powers, who would find means to bring him to reason. Now the most commodious place for such an assembly is the territory of Venice, because it is practically neutral and indifferent to all Princes; added thereto that it is near the sea, the most important monarchies of the earth, of those of the Pope, the two Emperors, and the King of Spain" (pp. 102-104).

Having established the suitability of Venice as the place of meeting, CRUCE proceeds: "But the difficulty is greater in regard to the rank to be given to the said ambassadors, who would not willingly yield to one another. . . Few people will deny the precedence to the Pope, both on account of the honour that Christian Princes accord him, and of the duty that they almost all render to him in spiritual matters, as well as for the respect of ancient Rome, of which he is the temporal Lord, and therefore the first place in all assemblies belongs to him or his legate" (p. 108). The second place the author would assign to the Sultan of Turkey because of "the majesty, power and happiness of his Empire, and also on account of the memory of the ancient Eastern Empire, of which Constantinople was the capital." The third place he would allocate to the Christian Emperor; the fourth to the King of France; and the fifth to the King of Spain. Next the claims of the Kings of Persia and China, PRESTER JOHN, the Precop [*sic*] of Tartary and the Grand Duke of Muscovy would fall to be arranged. Then the importance and order of precedence of the Kings of Great Britain, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Japan and Morocco, the Great Mogul and other monarchs would also demand attention. Among the other expedients which CRUCE suggested for solving the precedence difficulty was to give the first place to the first comer, or to the oldest, or again *à tour de role*.

Of his tribunal thus constituted CRUCE declared that "never was a council so august, nor assembly so honourable, as that of which we speak, which would be composed of ambassadors of all the monarchs and sovereign republics, who will be trustees and hostages of public peace. And the better to authorize it, all the said Princes will swear to hold as inviolable law what would be ordained by the majority of votes in the said assembly, and to pursue with arms those who would wish to oppose it. . . . By which means, peace being generally established between all Princes, there would remain nothing except to maintain it particularly in each monarchy; to which end all the sovereigns would work for their part, and would not have much difficulty to make themselves obeyed by their people and hold them in check. For what constrains monarchs to bear with their subjects is the fear that these associate themselves with strangers, or that these latter should profit by the divisions and quarrels between the subjects and the Prince. Now this fear would then be superfluous, because by means of peace each one would be content with his lordship, and would not think of anything else, but how to govern his people. He would be adored of the good, the bad would tremble at his appearance. . . . And thus the Princes would receive the principal fruit of universal peace" (pp. 120-124).

In bringing about universal peace, or preserving it after it has been proclaimed, the Paris monk deals with a variety of subjects, which can only be briefly referred to here. His general knowledge was great and he was steeped in the classics, and he applies his acquaintance with the mythology with that deadly effect familiar to all readers of CARLYLE. He admits that foreigners in certain circumstances should be welcomed, but he would give short shrift to the undesirable aljen. Great attention should be paid to the reclamation of waste lands and the cutting of canals. The currency should never be debased. His views of the sciences are crude. He assigns the first place for usefulness to medicine and mathematics, yet he does not think that jurisprudence is a necessary part of social economy; but in this he is not consistent. for at p. 258 he writes: "It is no easy matter to be a judge. The life and wealth of everyone depend upon this office. . . . The Prince

must be all the more careful to know the acts of the judges, and examine them like everything else of importance with his council, and especially to impress upon them to expedite promptly the suits, but the judgments must not be rushed. Pettifoggers should be punished, for they give cause to the people to murmur against the most saintly order of the world." CRUCE accepts and approves the doctrine of the divine right of kings. "Children beyond control" were not unknown in CRUCE's time, and for such he advocates "a commission of magistrates to have particular care of these young plants, in order that they produce good fruits" (p. 288). His views of elementary education seem sound, viz., that up to the age of fourteen children should be taught to read, write and count, and in addition should be given a knowledge of the laws and antiquity of their country. He also approves of what was really a Tonic Sol-fa system, viz., that practised by the Candiots, teaching the children to sing their lessons (p. 290). From fourteen he would have them taught to ride a horse, swim, jump, and the use of fire-arms, at the same time continuing their first exercises until they be eighteen years of age.

Comparing this brief summary of the views of the monastic writer of three centuries ago with existing and anticipated institutions, we may subscribe to CRUCE's *dictum* in mediæval French, "Que rien ne se voit nouueau soubs le soleil," or, as JEROME renders it, *Nihil sub sole novum.*

Reviews.

International Law.

TRACTATUS DE BELLO, DE REPRESALIIS ET DE DUELLO. By GIOVANNI DA LEGNANO, I.U.D., Professor of Civil and Canon Law in the University of Bologna. Edited by THOMAS ERSKINE HOLLAND, K.C. Printed for the Carnegie Institution of Washington at the Oxford University Press.

Mr. Justice Darling has given us, in the *Times* of 25th January, a passage from his "casual reading" which shows what reprisals were like in the Italian campaign of 1524—"the one which ended at Pavia with *tout est perdu fors l'honneur* after the death of *le Chevalier sans peur et sans reproche.*" We gather that honourable warfare was then known as *bonne guerre*, and dishonourable warfare, which resulted in reprisals, was known as *mauvaise guerre*. It is to be feared that the present war has been largely of the latter sort. But it is interesting to have in this sumptuous volume which has been produced by the Carnegie Institution of Washington an ordered exposition of the laws of war going back to a still earlier date, for Legnano lived in the fourteenth century, and his work on war and reprisals was produced, apparently in separate parts, about 1360.

The present work contains a *facsimile* reproduction of the Bologna manuscript, followed by a transcript of the same, as extended and revised by the editor, with his preparatory note, and then a translation of the text, as so extended and revised, by Mr. J. L. Brierley; and there are further biographical and bibliographical aids to the reader. Legnano's work, we are informed in the Introduction, was the earliest attempt to deal, as a whole, with the group of rights and duties which arise out of a state of war. As might be expected, it contains much curious reading. Whether it has any practical value at the present day we have not read far enough to say. It is satisfactory that it only seems to contemplate reprisals as being required for the protection of property. The volume is the first of a series of leading classics in International Law which it is proposed to republish in order that they may be available in convenient form for scientific study. The manner of production of the first volume indicates that neither care nor expense will be spared to make the series worthy of its design.

Books of the Week.

Accountancy.—Auditors: Their Duties and Responsibilities under the Companies Acts, Partnership Acts, and Acts relating to Executors and Trustees and to Private Audits. By FRANCIS W. PIXLEY, Barrister-at-Law. Eleventh Edition. Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons (Limited). 21s. net.

The Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law. New Series. Vol. 18, Part 2. December, 1918. Edited by Sir JOHN MACDONELL, K.C.B., LL.D., F.B.A., and C. E. A. BEDWELL. John Murray.

Sweet & Maxwell's Guide to the Legal Profession, The London LL.B., and to Students' Law Books. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited). 1s. net.

The Law Quarterly Review. Edited by the Rt. Hon. Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, Bart., D.C.L., LL.D. January, 1919. Stevens & Sons (Limited). 5s. net.

Correspondence.

A Ministry of Justice.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.*]

Sir,—The recent report of "The Machinery of Government Committee," presided over by Lord Haldane, has dealt fully with the subject of a Ministry of Justice, and has strongly emphasised the case which was so ably advocated by Mr. Garrett in his address to the members of the Law Society on 25th January, 1918.

In the report of the Committee it is suggested that the Lord Chancellor in his appointments to high judicial offices should be assisted by an Advisory Committee, a suggestion which will no doubt commend itself to all members of the profession.

The constitution of such Advisory Committee suggested in the report is, however, little calculated to effect the purpose aimed at, which is stated to be the making of such appointments to judicial offices as free as possible from personal or political influence. The proposed committee is to consist of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Chancellors who have preceded him, and the Lord Chief Justice. The report at the same time suggests that Lord Chancellors should be freed from the duties of daily or even of frequent judicial sitting, and if these suggestions are carried out the only member of the committee likely to have practical experience of the qualifications of members of the Bar for high office would be the Lord Chief Justice. All the other members of the committee would be persons appointed for political reasons.

Those who are best acquainted with the suitability of practising barristers for high judicial offices are (1) the judges before whom they practise, (2) the barristers who meet them in court day by day, and (3) the solicitors who give them their briefs.

On an Advisory Committee the Master of the Rolls should certainly be associated with the Lord Chief Justice, and with respect to the Bar and our branch of the profession there are already constituted two standing bodies who could be of the utmost assistance in selecting names from which the Lord Chancellor in whom the patronage is proposed to remain could choose, namely, the Bar Council and the Council of the Law Society.

If the Advisory Committee were to be composed of the Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls, two members of the Bar appointed by the Bar Council, and two solicitors appointed by the Council of the Law Society, it would constitute a body eminently fitted for advising the Lord Chancellor in respect of proposed appointments to high judicial office.

J. W. BUDD.

24, Austin Friars, London, E.C. 2. Jan. 27, 1919.

[Mr. Budd's letter supports the criticism we made on this point, *ante*, p. 188.—ED. *S.J.*]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Court of Appeal.

STOKER v. WORTHAM. No. 1. 29th January.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—"EMPLOYMENT OF A CASUAL NATURE"—TEMPORARY COOK—ENGAGEMENT FOR FOURTEEN DAYS—QUESTION OF FACT FOR COUNTY COURT JUDGE—WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906 (6 ED. 7, C. 58), S. 13.

The phrase "employment of a casual nature" in section 13 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, is one incapable of exact definition, and where upon the facts stated there can be said to be reasonable doubt whether the employment is or is not casual, the question is one of fact for the county court judge, and his decision will not be disturbed unless he has applied improper tests.

A woman engaged for fourteen days as a temporary cook in the absence of the regular cook held not to come within the Act, as being in "employment of a casual nature."

Rule stated by Hamilton, L.J., *in* Knight v. Bucknill (6 *B. W. C. C.* 160) *followed.*

Appeal by the applicant from an award of his Honour Judge Selfe, of the Marylebone County Court. The applicant, a widow, sixty years of age, was engaged as a temporary cook for a period of fourteen days, with an option to stay longer, if required, while the respondent's regular cook was away on a holiday. She was paid 15s. a week and given full board and lodging, living in the house. On the tenth day of her engagement she slipped on some oilcloth in the kitchen and fell heavily, fracturing her thigh. Upon her application for compensation the respondent contended that she was excluded from the benefit of the Act as being in "employment of a casual nature," and not for the purposes of any trade or business. The learned judge fully reviewed the authorities referred to below, and held on the facts that the employment was of a casual nature. The applicant appealed.

THE COURT dismissed the appeal.

SWINFEN EADY, M.R., having stated the facts, proceeded: The respondent took the objection that she was not a "workman" within the meaning of the Act, and the learned judge so decided. The applicant appealed. The Act, in section 13, contained a definition of "workman," which, so far as material, was as follows: "Workman" does not include any person . . . whose employment is of a casual nature and who is employed otherwise than for the purposes of the employer's trade or business . . . but save as aforesaid, means any person who has entered into or works under a contract of service or apprenticeship with an employer, whether by way of manual labour, clerical work, or otherwise, and whether the contract is express or implied, is oral or in writing. The objection taken was that in the present case the applicant's employment was of a casual nature, the facts being that she was employed for a short period to take the place of the regular cook. From time to time cases had arisen where the judges had tried to find adjectives to describe the word casual better. Hamilton, L.J., in *Knight* v. *Bucknill* (6 B. W. C. C. 160), said: I can think of no adjective to describe it better, nor will I venture to add an adjective to the already considerable list of those contrasted with it by various learned judges. There is a state of facts in which it would be impossible for a reasonable tribunal to say that work was casual, and equally there is a state of facts in which it would be impossible for a reasonable tribunal to say that it was permanent, but I am unable to formulate the test which would determine the boundary between these two conditions as a matter of law, and I think it may be inferred that when the state of facts is midway between these two states, so that the question is reasonably debatable, it must be for the county court judge to decide. In the same case Cozens-Hardy, M.R., said: I am quite unable to give a general definition of casual as opposed to regular employment which would meet every case. I do not think it even desirable to define within precise limits employment which is casual and employment which is not. In a subsequent case of *Smith* v. *Buxton* (8 B. W. C. C. 196) the Master of the Rolls, referring to *Knight* v. *Bucknill*, said that the Court had previously held that "casual" was a colloquial word and not a term of precision, and where the case was one which was reasonably debatable it must be for the county court judge to decide. The true rule was that laid down by Hamilton, L.J., in *Knight* v. *Bucknill*. There was a class of cases where the employment was clearly regular and not casual; another where it was as clearly casual; and between the two classes a debatable class as to which it was a question of fact whether the employment was or was not casual. The decision was one to be arrived at not by considering alone either the nature of the work, the amount of the wages, or the period of time for which the employment lasted, but all the facts of the case taken together. In his lordship's opinion that was what the learned county court judge had done in his very careful judgment in the case. He put the contentions made on behalf of each side before him and examined them. He did not think that because the employment was only for a period of fourteen days it was therefore of a casual nature. When he said that he agreed with the contention of the respondent, he did not adopt the whole of the argument, but merely the result of the contention, and said: "I think, tried by every test, that the employment was of a casual nature." On the facts of the case he came to the conclusion that it was one on the casual side of the dividing line, and he (his lordship) was of opinion that this decision could not be disturbed.

WARRINGTON and DUKE, L.JJ., delivered judgment to the same effect.—COUNSEL, *Cyril Atkinson*, K.C., and *Bernard Campion*; *Shakespeare*. SOLICITORS, *Oswald Hickson & Field*; *Harlow, Barlow, & Lyde*.

[Reported by H. LANGFORD LEWIS, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

Re **OGILVIE. OGILVIE** *v.* **OGILVIE.** Sargant, J. 16th January.

COMPANY—CAPITALIZATION OF PROFITS—TENANT FOR LIFE AND REMAINDERMEN.

Where a company altered its articles of association to permit of the capitalization of profits and did capitalize certain profits forming part of a reserve fund, and shares forming part of such capitalized profits devolved to a settled estate which already held shares in the company,

Held, that such shares formed part of the capital of the settled estate, and were not distributable as income. When a testator directs or permits the subject of his disposition to remain as stocks or shares in a company which has power either of distributing its profits as dividend or of converting them into capital, and the company exercises this power, such exercise is binding on all persons interested.

Bouch *v.* Sproule (12 App. Cas. 385) *and* Re Armitage (1893, 3 *Ch.* 337) *applied.*

This was an originating summons taken out by the trustee of the testator against his widow and daughter and an infant remainderman, raising the question whether certain shares received by the trustee of the testator as such trustee ought to be retained by him as part of the capital of the testator's residuary estate or ought to be transferred by him as income to the testator's widow, the present tenant for life under the trusts of his will. The trusts of the testator's will gave the income to his widow for her life, and subject thereto for his daughter in the event of her attaining twenty-one, but not to vest in the daughter absolutely, but she was to have the income for her life, and after her death for her children, and in default of children for certain other persons. At the time of his death the testator was the registered holder of 30,000 odd shares in the Powell Duffryn Steam Coal Co. (Limited). The articles of association were in common form, but in 1913 the company, by special resolution, added a new article, which gave them power to capitalize undivided profits. In March, 1913, the directors gave notice of an extraordinary general meeting to pass a resolution to take advantage of this new article and capitalize undivided profits in a reserve fund. This resolution was accompanied by a letter stating how the new shares were to be dealt with. There was no option given to the shareholder but to take these profits in shares, and the resolution was duly passed. Counsel for the tenant for life contended that the new shares belonged to the tenant for life as income, inasmuch as they were distributed as dividend out of a reserve fund consisting of profits. By the original articles the company could not distribute a dividend in shares and not in cash. When the articles were altered for the express purpose of allowing this, the distribution did not make what was given any the less income. He referred to numerous cases, including *Bouch* v. *Sproule* (12 A. C. 385), *Wood* v. *Odessa Waterworks Co.* (42 Ch. D. 636); *Re Armitage* (1893, 3 Ch. 337), *Re Malam* (1894, 3 Ch. 578); *Re Thomas* (1916, 2 Ch. 331); *Re Hutton* (1917, 1 Ch. 357); *Re Palmer* (56 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 363); *Re Evans* (1913, 1 Ch. 23); *Swan Brewery Co.* v. *R.* (1914, A. C. 231). Counsel for the remainderman argued that the shares were capital of the estate, not income, and should be held as such.

SARGANT, J., after stating the facts, said: In coming to my decision I am not influenced by the sentence in the circular as to the shares not being income. Ever since the decision in *Bouch* v. *Sproule* (*supra*) the law has been quite settled as to the general principles on which such a case as this is to be decided. At page 397 of the report of the case Lord Herschell said: "I quite agree with the court below that, apart from the authorities to which I have alluded, the general principle for the determination of such a question as that before us—and, in my opinion, the only sound principle—is that which is well expressed in the judgment of Fry, L.J.: 'When a testator or settlor directs or permits the subject of his disposition to remain as stocks or shares in a company which has power either of distributing its profits as dividend or of converting them into capital, and the company validly exercises this power, such exercise of its power is binding on all persons interested under the testator or settlor in the shares, and consequently what is paid by the company as dividend goes to the tenant for life and what is paid by the company to the shareholder as capital or appropriated as an increase of the capital stock in the concern enures to the benefit of all who are interested in the capital.'" From what was said in that case in the House of Lords, and by Stirling, J., in the case of *Re Malam* (1894), 3 Ch. 578), it is clear that the Court has to look as much at the substance as at the form of the transaction. The same principle has been acted on in the case of *Re Armitage* (1893, 3 Ch. 337), and has been unquestioned ever since. Mr. Grant has had to admit that, if there had been an option to take either in cash or shares, and the option had been exercised in favour of shares, *Bouch* v. *Sproule* would have exactly applied and the shares would have been capitalized. The fact that the company has given no option to the shareholder, but has taken advantage of its new articles to distribute in the form of share capital, is an argument in favour of and not against its intention to have a capital distribution. The shares taken by the plaintiff must be held by him as capital of the estate, and not transferred to the tenant for life as income.—COUNSEL, *Warwick Draper*; *Alexander Grant*, K.C., and *Cecil W. Turner*; *E. Whinney*. SOLICITORS, *Davidson & Morriss*.

[Reported by L. M. MAY, Barrister-at-Law.]

CASES OF LAST SITTINGS.

High Court—King's Bench Division.

LONDON PROVINCIAL AND SOUTH-WESTERN BANK, (LIM.), *v.* **BUSZARD.** A. T. Lawrence, J. 12th December.

BANKERS—BRANCH BANKS—CHEQUE DRAWN ON ONE BRANCH—STOPPAGE—NOTICE NOT GIVEN TO OTHER BRANCHES—PAYMENT BY ANOTHER BRANCH.

The drawer of a cheque on one branch of a bank stopped payment thereof at that branch, but did not give notice of stoppage to any other branch of the bank. The cheque was presented by the drawee of the cheque to the manager of another branch of the bank, who advanced money upon it. The manager had no notice of the stoppage of the cheque, and he acted in good faith.

Held, that the branch was entitled to recover the amount from the drawer of the cheque.

Action tried without a jury. The claim was against the defendant as the drawer of a cheque for £100, dated 5th February, 1918, payable in favour and to the order of a Mrs. Try. The cheque was indorsed by Mrs. Try to the plaintiffs, who advanced money upon it, but payment thereof was stopped by the defendant and the cheque was dishonoured when presented. The plaintiffs had a branch bank at Victoria-street, Westminster, of which the manager was Mr. Stephen Trott. Mrs. Try was a customer there, and had been in the habit, for some considerable time before the date above mentioned, of receiving cheques from the defendant and paying them into her account at the Victoria-street branch and drawing against them before they were cleared. On 8th February, 1918, Mrs. Try brought to the manager the cheque for £100.

drawn in her favour by the defendant on the Oxford-street branch, and requested the manager to cash it, and he did so. He had no reason to suspect there was anything wrong, and he had no notice of the fact that the defendant had stopped the cheque at the Oxford-street branch. It appeared that on 2nd February, 1918, the defendant had written to the manager of the Oxford-street branch stopping the cheque, and this letter was acknowledged by a post-card from the manager of the Oxford-street branch to the defendant as having been received on 4th February at that branch. The 2nd February was a Saturday, and the manager did not therefore receive the letter until 4th February. It was contended on behalf of the defendant that notice at one of the branches of the plaintiff bank not to pay the cheque was notice of stoppage to all the branches, as all the branches were part of the same firm, and the cheque was subject to all the equities with which it was affected in the hands of Mrs. Try. As the cheque was post-dated the notice not to pay was equivalent to a notice that the cheque would be dishonoured and that there was something wrong with the cheque: *Robertson* v. *Sheward* (1840, 1 M. & G. 511) was cited as shewing that the head office of a bank and all its branches constitute only one corporation or firm. This is also stated in Hart's Law of Banking, 3rd ed., p. 88, where it is added that each branch is a separate agency of the common principal. For the plaintiffs it was contended that *Clode* v. *Bayley* (1843, 12 M. & W. 51) was decisive. In that case a bill of exchange was indorsed to a branch of the National Provincial Bank of England at Portmadoc, who sent it to the Pwllheli branch of the same bank, who indorsed it to the head establishment in London. It was held that each of the branch banks was to be considered as independent indorsees, and each entitled to the usual notice of dishonour. [A. T. LAWRENCE, J., also pointed out, in reference to the contention of the defendant that notice of dishonour to one branch was notice to all, that the statement in Hart's Law of Banking excepted the very case of notice of dishonour from the general rule as to the effect of notices given to a bank at any of its branch offices.]

A. T. LAWRENCE, J., in giving judgment, said the facts of the case were clear, and the cheque on which this action was brought was stopped at the Oxford-street branch only, and no notice of this was received at the Victoria-street branch, where the cheque was presented by Mrs. Try and money advanced to her thereupon by the manager of that branch of the bank. In his opinion, the fact that the branch at Oxford-street had notice from the drawer not to pay the cheque to Mrs. Try was not notice to the Victoria-street branch, and did not affect the bank with notice. The plaintiff bank was the holder of the cheque for value, and, not being affected with the notice, was entitled to judgment. It appeared from the case of *Clode* v. *Bayley* (*supra*) that with regard to notices of dishonour, each branch of a bank was to be considered as independent, and entitled to the usual notice of dishonour. It had been urged by counsel for the defendant that this action was on a bill of exchange, and that there were many differences between bills of exchange and cheques in regard to the steps to be taken in giving notice of dishonour, and that what applied to a bill of exchange did not apply to the cheque in question in this action. His lordship, however, did not accept this attempted distinction. The money, on presentation of the cheque by Mrs. Try, had been paid in good faith by the manager of the Victoria-street branch. There was nothing which affected the right of the bank to rely on the rule as to notice of stopping a cheque at one branch of a bank not affecting another branch of the same bank as laid down in *Clode* v. *Bayley* (*supra*). The evidence as to the actual time when the notice was given was indecisive, but there appeared to be no doubt that on 8th February, when the manager at the Victoria-street branch advanced money on the cheque, he had no notice whatever of the cheque being stopped. Judgment for the plaintiffs.—COUNSEL, *Hogg*, K.C., and *Patrick Hastings*, for the plaintiffs; *Cannot*, for the defendant. SOLICITORS, *Strong & Bolden*; *Percy Bono & Co.*

[Reported by G. H. KNOTT, Barrister-at-Law.]

New Orders, &c.

War Orders and Proclamations, &c.

The *London Gazette* of 24th January contains the following, in addition to matters printed below:—

1. An Order in Council, dated 24th January, making additions to the Statutory List under the Trading with the Enemy (Extension of Powers) Act, 1915, as follows:—

Morocco (1); Netherlands (5); Netherland East Indies (1); Spain (5).

There are also a number of removals from the List. A List (The Consolidated List No. 68A) consolidating all previous Lists up to and including that of 15th November, 1918, together with List No. 69 of 29th November, List No. 70 of 13th December, List No. 71 of 20th December, 1918, List No. 72 of 3rd January, List No. 73 of 17th January, 1919, and the present List contain all the names which up to this date are included in the Statutory List.

2. An Order in Council, dated 24th January, further amending the Proclamation, dated 10th May, 1917, and made under section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, and section 1 of the Exportation of Arms Act, 1900, and section 1 of the Customs (Exportation Prohibition) Act, 1914, whereby the exportation from the United Kingdom of certain articles to certain or all destinations was prohibited. A number of headings are deleted, and a few added.

3. A further Notice that licences under the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Act, 1918, have been granted to certain companies, firms and individuals. The present list contains 16 names.

4. An Admiralty Notice, dated 23rd January, of cancellation of the Bung Gut and Goldbeater Skins Order, 1917, made by them on the 19th day of March, 1917.

5. An Army Council Notice, dated 17th January, of cancellation of the Imported Hides (Control) Notice, 1916, and the Imported Hides (Dealings) Order, 1916.

The *London Gazette* of 28th January contains the following:—

6. A Foreign Office (Foreign Trade Department) Notice, dated 14th January, 1919, that certain names have been added to the list of persons and bodies of persons to whom articles to be exported to Siam may be consigned.

7. An Admiralty Notice, dated 27th January, of cancellation of the Anchors and Chain Cables Order made by them on the 27th day of September, 1917.

Army Council Orders.

CANCELLATION OF THE ORDER PROHIBITING THE LIFTING OF HAY AND STRAW IN ENGLAND AND WALES IN SO FAR AS IT RELATES TO STRAW.

In pursuance of the powers conferred on them by the Defence of the Realm Regulations and of all other powers thereunto enabling them, the Army Council hereby give notice that the Army Council Order dated the 30th day of July, 1918, relative to the prohibition of the lifting and using of Hay and Straw in England and Wales is hereby cancelled in so far as it relates to all oat straw, wheat straw, rivet wheat straw, buckwheat straw, barley straw, mustard straw, rye straw, pea straw, bean straw and threshed tares in respect of which at the date this Order shall come into force no Purchase Note has been signed, and that all the above-mentioned Forage is hereby released: but this cancellation and release shall not affect the previous operation of the said Order or the validity of any action taken under the same or the liability to any penalty or punishment in respect of any contravention of or failure to comply with such Order before the date this Order shall come into force or any proceeding or remedy in respect of any such penalty or punishment: nor shall this cancellation and release affect the provisions of the Army Council Order dated the 20th day of August, 1918, relative to the regulation of the sale of Hay and Straw and of Chopped Hay and Straw in England and Wales or of any Order amending that Order, which Order or Orders shall remain in force.

This Order shall come into force on the 1st day of February, 1919.
23rd January. [*Gazette*, 28th January.

REGULATION OF THE SALE OF HAY AND STRAW AND OF CHOPPED HAY AND STRAW IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

In pursuance of the powers conferred on them by the Defence of the Realm Regulations and of all other powers thereunto enabling them, the Army Council hereby cancel, in so far as it relates to Straw, paragraph 1 of Schedule 3 of the Army Council Order of the 20th day of August, 1918, relative to the regulation of the sale of Hay and Straw and of Chopped Hay and Straw in England and Wales in relation to Straw, and substitute the following:—

"1. All Straw sold for civilian purposes, whether to a wholesale Dealer or Retailer, will be invoiced by the Producer or Grower to such wholesale Dealer or Retailer at the cost price at stack as provided by this Order."

The following clause shall be added after Schedule 3, paragraph 2 (g):—

"(h) For buying charges in the case of Straw, 1s. 6d. per ton."

This Order shall come into force on the 1st day of February, 1919.
23rd January. [*Gazette*, 28th January.

[There are similar Orders for Scotland.]

Board of Trade Order.

THE PITWOOD ORDER, 1918.

Notice.

Pursuant to Paragraph 3 of the Pitwood Order, 1918, notice is hereby given, that as and from the 17th day of February, 1919, the maximum prices at which Pitwood imported from outside the United Kingdom may be bought or sold or offered for sale or purchase in the United Kingdom shall be as follows:—

(1) Pitprops cut to lengths delivered on rail at mine sidings or, failing rail connection, at mine premises:—

	s.	d.	
3½ inches	33	0	per 100 lineal feet.
4 "	42	6	" " "
4½ "	50	9	" " "
5 "	60	0	" " "
5½ "	73	6	" " "
6 "	88	0	" " "
6½ "	101	6	" " "
7 "	120	0	" " "

Terms 2½ per cent. discount on usual monthly account.

(2) Pitwood imported from France, Portugal, or Spain, delivered ex ship at South Wales Ports, 60s. per ton for hardwood and 65s. per ton for softwood.

28th January. [*Gazette*, 28th January.

Food Orders.

HORSES RATIONING ORDER.

General Licence.

1. The Food Controller hereby authorizes the feeding of Horses falling within the Fourth Schedule to the Horses (Rationing No. 2) Order, 1918 [S.R. & O., No. 1331 of 1918], with cereal foodstuffs, at the following rates:—

Class of horse.	*Maximum Daily Ration in terms of oats.*
Horses, 15 hands and over	7 lbs.
Horses, 14 hands and under 15 hands ...	6 lbs.
Horses, under 14 hands	4 lbs.

Provided that as regards such horses the records mentioned in Clause 6 of the Order are kept and are open to inspection as provided by that Clause.

2. For the purposes of this licence cereal foodstuffs other than oats may be used in the proportions mentioned in Clause 4 of the Order.

12th December.

THE CANNED MEATS (DISTRIBUTION) ORDER, 1918.

1. *Forms of Application may be prescribed.*]—(*a*) The Food Controller may from time to time prescribe forms of application and other documents to be used for the purpose of obtaining, or for any other purpose connected with canned meats proposed to be distributed, or for the time being in the course of distribution, by or under the authority of the Food Controller (hereinafter called canned meats), and any such form or document may contain instructions to be observed as to the completion of the form or any other matter.

(*b*) The Food Controller may from time to time issue instructions relating to the distribution, disposal or use of Canned Meats.

2. All persons concerned shall in the completion of any such form or document and in the distribution, disposal or use of any Canned Meats comply with the instructions and directions relative thereto for the time being in force.

3. *False statements, &c.*]

4. *Prescribed forms.*]—Any form of application or other document purporting to be prescribed pursuant to this Order or headed Canned Meats (Distribution) Order, 1918, shall be deemed unless the contrary be proved to be prescribed pursuant to this Order.

5. This Order may be cited as the Canned Meats (Distribution) Order, 1918.

13th December.

NOTICE OF REVOCATION OF PIG (SALES) ORDER, 1918.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by the Defence of the Realm Regulations and of all other powers enabling him in that behalf the Food Controller hereby revokes as from the 29th December, 1918, the Pig (Sales) Order, 1918 [S.R. & O., No. 1223 of 1918], but without prejudice to any proceedings in respect of any contravention thereof.

19th December.

THE PIG (PRICES) ORDER (No. 2), 1918.

1. *Maximum Price for pig, live or dead.*]—(*a*) Where a person sells for slaughter any live pig otherwise than by dead weight, the maximum price shall be at the rate of 21s. per score of the live weight.

(*b*) Where a person sells for slaughter any live pig by dead weight or sells any dead pig, the maximum price, if the offals are included in the sale, shall be at the rate of 28s. per score of the dead weight, and if the offals are not included in the sale, shall be at the rate of 26s. 9d. per score of the dead weight.

2. *Variation of Prices.*]—The Food Controller may from time to time vary any or all of the prices specified in Clause 1 hereof by notice under this Order.

3. *Ascertaining Weights.*]

4. *Records.*]

5. *Offers, &c.*]—A person shall not sell or offer or expose for sale or buy or agree to buy any pig, live or dead, at a price exceeding the price applicable under the Order, or in connection with the sale or disposition or proposed sale or disposition of any pig enter or offer to enter into any artificial or fictitious transaction or make or demand any unreasonable charge.

6. *Presumption as to Sale, &c.*]—Until the contrary be proved a pig shall be deemed to have been sold and bought for slaughter if it be slaughtered within twenty-eight days of the sale.

7. *Interpretation.*]—For the purposes of this Order:—

"Score" means 20 lbs.

"Food Committee" means, as regards Great Britain, a Food Control Committee constituted in pursuance of the Food Control Committees (Constitution) Order, 1917, and as regards Ireland, the Food Control Committee appointed for Ireland by the Food Controller.

"Dressed Carcase" means the carcase of the pig without the offal and shall include the whole of the flair or leaf, the head, kidneys, skirtings, feet and skin. The carcase shall not be trimmed at the throat, ears and nose, except by the removal of the hair.

"Offals" includes plucks, chitterlings, liver, intestines, loose fats, hearts and lights.

9. *Revocation, &c.*]—(*a*) The Pigs (Prices) Order, 1918 [S.R. & O., No. 375 of 1918], is revoked as regards Ireland as from the 29th December, 1918, but without prejudice to any proceedings in respect of any contravention thereof.

(*b*) This Order shall come into force on the 29th December, 1918.

(*c*) *Title.*]—This Order may be cited as the Pigs (Prices) Order (No. 2), 1918.

20th December.

THE RATIONING ORDER, 1918.

DIRECTIONS RELATING TO THE AMOUNT OF RATIONED FOOD.

1. The appropriate leaves and coupons of the Ration Books (A) and (B) and the Travellers Ration Books shall be—

For meat, the leaves numbered 1, 1x, 1y, and 1z and the coupons thereon.

For butter and margarine, the leaf numbered 3 and the coupons thereon.

For sugar, the leaf numbered 4, and the coupons thereon.

2. A coupon numbered 1 on a leaf relates to the week beginning Sunday, the 3rd November, 1918, and the other coupons relate to the subsequent weeks in due numerical order.

3. A butter and margarine coupon is available for use only during the week to which such coupon relates.

Each meat coupon is available for use during that week and also the subsequent four days.

A sugar coupon is available for use during the week to which it relates and the 3 succeeding weeks.

4. Until further notice the weekly ration of butter and margarine shall be 5 ozs. until the 11th January and 6 ozs. thereafter; of sugar, 8 ozs. until the 25th January and 12 oz. thereafter, and not more than the prescribed amount may be obtained or supplied on the coupon.

5. Until further notice the amount of meat which may be obtained on any meat coupon shall be the amount in weight or worth of meat prescribed as the value of a coupon according to the Table of Equivalent Weights for the time being in force. Where worth of meat is prescribed, such worth shall be ascertained at the maximum retail price therefor for the time being applicable under the Orders of the Food Controller. Until further notice such Table shall be the Table set forth in the Schedule hereto.

6. Until further notice any meat coupon may be used for obtaining any kind of meat or for obtaining a meat meal from a catering establish

ment, or in the case mentioned in the Rationing Order, 1918, for obtaining a meat meal from an institution.

7. Coupons on Leave or Duty Ration Books, Demobilization Ration Books and Emergency Ration Cards and Invalids' leaves may be used as shewn thereon.

* * *

Schedule.

[Table of Equivalent Weights of Meat.]

The following Food Orders have also been issued :—

The Rationing Order, 1918 : Order Amending the Directions for Catering Establishments and Institutions (S.R. & O. No. 1332 of 1918). 6th December.

Order amending the Flour and Bread (Prices) Order, 1917. 12th December.

Order amending the Bacon, Ham and Lard (Provisional Prices) Order, 1917, Amendment Order, 1918. 12th December.

Order amending the Bacon, Ham and Lard (Prices) Order, 1918. 12th December.

Order amending the Edible Offals (Maximum Prices) Order, 1918. 20th December.

The Rationing Order, 1918 : Directions for Retailers of Sugar, and Butter and Margarine, and their Customers. 31st December.

The Rationing Order, 1918 : Directions for Retailers of Bacon and Ham, and Lard, and their Customers. 31st December.

Societies.

Union Society of London.

SESSION 1918-19.

The twelfth meeting of the society was held in the Middle Temple Common Room on Wednesday, 29th January, 1919, at 8 p.m. The subject for debate was : "That the present unrest in the world is mainly due to the unfair distribution of wealth." Opener, Mr. C. R. Morden ; opposer, Mr. A. Safford. The motion was carried.

The Valuation of Land Taken for Public Purposes.

The following is the summary of recommendations which concludes the Second Report of Mr. Leslie Scott's Acquisition of Land Committee :—

61. Our main recommendations may be summarised as follows :—

(i) The Lands Clauses Acts are now out of date, and should be repealed and replaced by a fresh code. (Para. 6.)

(ii) The standard of value to be paid to the owner should be the market value as between a willing buyer and a willing seller in addition to fair compensation for consequential injury. (Para. 8.)

(iii) No allowance for the compulsory acquisition of land should be added to the market value. (Para. 9.)

(iv) The owner shall not be entitled to any increased value for his land, which can only arise, or could only have arisen, by reason of the suitability of the land for a purpose to which it could only be applied under statutory powers. (Para. 10.)

(v) No enhancement of market value should be taken into account which arises from the use of the premises in question in a manner contrary to sanitary or other laws and regulations. (Para. 11.)

(vi) Wherever no market exists for a property which is being compulsorily acquired the price to be paid to the owner may at the discretion of the Tribunal be assessed on the basis of reinstatement. (Para. 12.)

(vii) The value of all separate interests in a property having a marketable value should be assessed in separate awards, but by the same Tribunal ; and, so far as practicable, at the same time ; claims for consequential damage, &c., being similarly dealt with. (Para. 15.)

(viii) The Promoters should be allowed at any time within the period allowed for service of the notice to treat to serve a notice to treat in respect of any interest in land to operate as from any date not being later than the date fixed for the completion of the works, the price to be paid to be assessed as at the date of the service of the Notice to Treat. (Para. 16.)

(ix) Where there are persons or a body capable of receiving the purchase money as Trustees for the Vendors and their successors, the Vendors should not be considered as persons under a disability. In general, where the claimant can prove that acting reasonably he is put to special expense for re-investment, the costs of a single re-investment should be allowed in the items of the claim. (Para. 17.)

(x) Promoters should have power to take part only a property whenever they think fit. In cases where, as the result of the owner's claim for injurious affection, promoters find it cheaper to buy the whole site, and it happens that part of the whole projects beyond the limits of deviation, the promoter should have power to go to the Sanctioning Authority to obtain power for the additional area. The notice to treat could be amended accordingly. (Para. 18.)

(xi) Promoters should have power to acquire an easement in over or under land whenever such easement will be sufficient for the purposes of the undertaking. (Para. 19.)

(xii) The Promoters should be entitled to withdraw their notice to treat at any time within two months of the delivery of the claim, or such earlier or later date as the Tribunal may direct on the application of either party, on payment of all proper costs as between solicitor and client, and also on such compensation for loss or injury as in the opinion of the Tribunal has been occasioned by the notice to treat having been given and withdrawn. (Para. 20.)

(xiii) Notices to treat should be served within such period as the Sanctioning Authority may direct ; or, if the Sanctioning Authority make no direction within 12 months of the order of the Sanctioning Authority conferring compulsory powers. (Para. 21.)

(xiv) Where Promoters acquire land which is subject to outside restrictions on its use, the Promoters should be entitled to use the land free from any such restrictions on paying compensation to the persons entitled to the benefit of such restrictions, if such persons are, in fact, damaged by the breach of such restrictions. And even where no application for land is pending before the Sanctioning Authority either because the land has been acquired by voluntary agreement or because no additional land is needed, it should be open to the Sanctioning Authority to extinguish or modify a restrictive covenant upon proper terms as to compensation or otherwise wherever they are of opinion that it is in the public interest that such covenant should be so extinguished or modified. (Para. 22.)

(xv) The obligation of or offer by promoters to provide accommodation works for the benefit of vendors, and the nature of the works required, should be dealt with, in cases where the accommodation works are an integral part of the scheme, by the Sanctioning Authority when the scheme is sanctioned, and in other cases by the Compensation Tribunal when the compensation is settled.

In either case the benefit to the vendor of the accommodation works ordered, whether at the instance of the promotors or the vendor, should be taken into consideration by way of reduction in assessing the price to be paid for the land. It is recognized, however, that the Sanctioning Authority and the Compensation Tribunal should have power to

postpone their decision as to accommodation works, in cases where they think that the question cannot be properly decided until sufficient time has elapsed to gauge the effect of the promoters' undertaking on the vendors' property. (Para. 23.)

(xvi) Subject to any limitations which the Sanctioning Authority in sanctioning a scheme may think fit to impose in special cases, promoters should have an unrestricted power to hold and dispose of surplus land, and any general statutory provisions as to the pre-emption rights of adjoining owners, etc., should, as regards schemes sanctioned by the Sanctioning Authority, cease to have effect. (Para. 24.)

(xvii) In every case the Sanctioning Authority should consider whether the minerals should be excepted from or included in a conveyance of land to promoters. (Para. 25.)

(xviii) (*a*) The Tribunal may, if the parties agree, consist of a single arbitrator appointed by them, but if the parties do not so agree, the Tribunal should consist of one arbitrator to be appointed by the Sanctioning Authority from a panel. In the ordinary case, we think that the Tribunal should be limited to one arbitrator, but in a special case the Sanctioning Authority should have discretion, if it thinks fit, to appoint a large and special Tribunal. It should be within the discretion of the Tribunal to exclude the public, but we think that as a rule publicity is desirable. (Paras. 26 and 27.)

(*b*) Either party should be at liberty to obtain from the Inland Revenue Valuation Department any existing official valuations affecting the property in question, and such valuations should be admissible in evidence. (Para. 28.)

(xix) (*a*) The Sanctioning Authority should have general authority to make rules as to the practice and procedure to be observed by the Tribunal, and the principles on which costs should be dealt with.

(*b*) We consider it essential that the claimant should be required to serve on the promoters full particulars of his claim, which would state the exact nature of the interest in respect of which compensation is claimed and details of the compensation claimed, distinguishing the amounts under separate heads and shewing how the amount claimed under each head is calculated.

(*c*) Subject to any principles to be laid down by the Sanctioning Authority the Tribunal should have an absolute discretion as to costs, and it should be its duty to consider and determine in each case by whom and in what proportion such costs shall be borne.

(*d*) The Tribunal should have power to call expert witnesses, and both parties should be allowed to cross-examine such expert witnesses. The Tribunal should also have power to appoint an accountant to examine books and accounts, and to order all necessary books and accounts to be produced for the inspection of such accountant, who should be available for cross-examination by both sides. Taxation returns in the possession of the Inland Revenue Department should also be produced upon request by the Tribunal. (Para. 29.)

(xx) We consider that the Sanctioning Authority should, in framing their rules of procedure before the Compensation Tribunal, relax the rigid English rule excluding individual instances of sales and other dealings in land from evidence in chief, in favour of the Scottish practice which admits them. (Para. 30.)

(xxi) Either party should have the right to appeal to the High Court of Justice on a question of law, and if such a question of law is raised, it should be stated in the award (whether interim or final) in the form of a special case. In Scotland special legislative provision should be made for an appeal on a question of law by way of stated case to the Inner House of the Court of Session. (Para. 31.)

[*To be continued.*]

Trustees and the New War Bonds.

The following letter appeared in the *Times* of 29th January :—

Sir,—Is it disloyal to point out the Daniac nature of the Treasury's offer of the new Registered Coupon Bonds? This is ostensibly made for the convenience of trustees; but, if accepted, will work great inconvenience for the beneficiaries in receipt of the trust income and great advantage for the Treasury.

At present the interest both on the Five per Cent. War Loan and the Five per Cent. Registered Bonds is paid without deduction of income tax, and the beneficiaries have to pay the tax thereon as part of their income for the financial year succeeding that in which the interest was received. Thus, income from Five per Cent. War Loan received during the year to 5th April, 1918, is for purposes of taxation a part of the income of the taxpayer for the year to 5th April, 1919. So that, before it becomes payable, the beneficiary who is not taxed at the full rate can make his return for abatement or reduction of the rate, and he is thus saved from being out of pocket for more than his due in taxation of income from this source. This suspended payment is some compensation for the full deductions made on income from general investments, of which deductions the taxpayer entitled to relief can only recover his share in the year succeeding payment, and at much labour and in most cases the expense of expert assistance.

The only inconvenience to trustees caused by the present arrangement lies in having to furnish to the Revenue the names and addresses of their beneficiaries, so that the tax gatherers may see that proper returns are made. Even for those beneficiaries whose income exceeds £2,000 (the present limit for reduction of rate) there is an appreciable advantage in having the tax payment on this source of income deferred for a year. This, of course, involves an injustice to the Exchequer; but its loss must be recouped ten thousand times by the receipt of tax paid in direct taxation at the highest rate on companies' dividends, whereof the overcharge on small incomes is not refunded until the year succeeding payment, and often later. So that trustees who take up the Registered Coupon Bonds will save themselves some slight trouble, while inflicting a real hardship on those whose interests they stand to protect.

May I also point out that the new Four per Cent. tax-compounded bonds are unavailable for trustees, even though taken up under certificate? For trustees purchasing these bonds would be paying 1½ per cent. premium solely for the advantage, or presumed advantage, of the present income-receivers, to the detriment of capital, and, by consequence, of the income, of those entitled in reversion. Clearly this would be a breach of trust. The prohibition of these bonds to trustees is a hardship on beneficiaries with incomes exceeding the relief limit, who anticipate with gloom a further increase in the taxpayer's burden. Of course the bonds will be available for trustees if their beneficiaries pay the premium.

21st January. FAMILY SOLICITOR.

Waste of Time in the Law Courts.

The following short account, says the *Times* of Thursday, of the happenings in Mr. Justice Sankey's Court yesterday illustrate the propriety, or otherwise, of the constant complaints made by solicitors and others about the delay that generally attends the entry for trial of causes in the Royal Courts of Justice. When the learned Judge took his seat at 10.15 the plaintiff was found to be represented in the first case, but it could not be proceeded with, as a material witness was not in attendance. There was a wait for a quarter of an hour, and then the case, undefended, was begun, but was almost immediately adjourned for the reason already given. The other two cases were then called, but were struck out, as none of the parties appeared. In order to save the waste of a day the learned Judge at 10.45 sent to Mr. Justice McCardie's Court, but his list had already fallen through. Application was then made (10.50) to Mr. Justice Lush, but it was stated that the last of four cases in his list was "on" in that Court.

Mr. Justice Sankey then retired to his rooms, and with a devotion to duty which is not as rare as it is reported to be by certain persons, waited until 11.45, when a common jury case was sent to him.

These facts constitute their own comment, but it would seem a simple act of courtesy if solicitors would from time to time inform Mr. Kenyon, the Chief Associate, as to the condition of their entered causes.

The Housing Problem.

In his presidential address to the 400 delegates from rural district councils of England and Wales at a conference of the Rural District Councils Association, held at Guildhall on Tuesday, says the *Times*, Sir Courtenay Warner, M.P., said he was revealing no secret when he told them that Dr. Addison had been appointed to his office because he wished to deal with the question of housing. There could be no permanent remedy for the problem unless it provided for an economic rent. He believed that the Government had under consideration the payment of 75 per cent. of the loss incurred over and above what would be produced by a penny rate.

The Rev. R. V. O. Graves, Chairman of the Malden Rural Council, read a paper on "Housing in Purely Rural Districts," and resolutions were passed in favour of schemes of rural housing being carried out by rural district councils, but limiting the cost in rural districts to a penny rate; and in favour of local authorities being empowered to borrow on the security of the district rate, and to lend such money, under proper safeguards, to individuals who were able and willing to build houses in their district.

During a discussion of the housing problem at a meeting of the West Ham Town Council, Councillor Godbold said that thousands of people in the borough were living under horrible and brutal conditions, and children were in an awful state as the result. If the council did not soon do something to put the borough in a healthier state and build suitable houses, the ratepayers would come out on strike for this to be done.

Councillor Jack Jones, M.P., said that in West Ham there were hundreds of houses unfit for habitation, and these should be pulled down and rebuilt. He did not care where the money came from—either from the Government or from the local exchequer, but the work would

have to be carried out. The Government, through Mr. Lloyd George, had made promises in this direction, and he would be held to his word.

Alderman Will Thorne, M.P., said that private enterprise could not cope with the difficulty owing to the increased price of materials, and the Government must render aid. Old Canning Town, for example, wanted all pulling down and rebuilding, for the houses were in a shocking state.

It was decided to schedule the houses in the borough not fit to live in, prepare details as to the vacant land in the borough and submit a scheme to the Government.

Peace League Plan from Norway.

The *Times* correspondent in Norway, in a message from Christiania, dated 29th January, says :—

The Council of the Norwegian Association of the League of Nations, which has been holding a series of meetings under the able presidency of Dr. Nansen, brought its deliberations to an end last night. It has drawn up a draft of general principles to be submitted to the Peace Conference at Paris.

Among the fourteen points in the Norwegian draft the following are the chief :—

The purpose of the League is to make war impossible; accordingly all international conflicts must be settled by agreement, arbitration, or judicial sentence.

Abolition of conscription.

General disarmament and the prohibition of the private manufacture of war material.

Equal economic standing for all members of the League.

Supreme power to rest in a world's Congress at which the nations shall be represented according to the number of their inhabitants and their international position, the restriction of representation not to exceed one-twelfth of the aggregate number of representatives. The Congress to be vested with legislative authority in all matters under its jurisdiction.

The executive power of the League to rest with a permanent International Council of fifteen members.

Companies.

London Joint City and Midland Bank, Ltd.

The general meeting of the shareholders of the London Joint City and Midland Bank (Limited) was held at the Cannon Street Hotel, London, E.C., on Wednesday, 29th January, 1919, for the purpose of receiving the report and balance-sheet, declaring a dividend, electing directors and auditors, and other ordinary business. There was a large attendance.

The Chairman (Sir Edward H. Holden, Bart.), who was warmly received, made a lengthy and elaborate speech, in the course of which he dealt with the estimated net debts of England, Germany and America as affected by war expenditure; with the report of the Committee on Currency and the Foreign Exchanges; and with the balance-sheet of the bank for last year.

Defects of the Bank Charter Act.

The reply to the Currency Committee's report, and the criticism on its recommendations may perhaps be regarded as the section of the widest general interest as well as of the greatest financial importance. Sir Edward, after reviewing the circumstances in which the issue of Treasury notes was decided on, and admitting that the relief they gave was a factor in the increase of prices, said that the increased issue was absolutely necessary. He renewed his criticism of the Bank Charter Act, and repeated his argument of a year ago that it should be repealed, that the bank should be authorized to issue notes on the security of gold and bills of exchange, that the two departments should be amalgamated and the whole of the liabilities and assets shown in one balance-sheet. Bankers had, he said, a great work before them to provide means for the reconstruction of trade, and they should not be left in doubt—they ought to know definitely that in case of necessity the bank notes or currency notes should be provided.

A 10 Per Cent. Bank Rate.

The bank cannot issue notes except against gold, and can only issue notes against securities with the sanction of the Treasury. Whenever this has been previously given it has been stipulated that the bank rate should be put up to about 10 per cent. To adopt such a method when the country is reconstructing its trade and industry, and when manufacturers and others were requiring increased accommodation, would lead to undue restriction of credit, would impede reconstruction, and would curtail our exports, just at a time when we were anxious to export more than we had ever exported before. The result might be serious for the nation. No proper discrimination is made between the case when additional currency is needed to meet trade requirements, and the case when additional currency is needed in consequence of over-trading.

The Two Departments of the Bank of England.

The Chairman strongly advocated the issue of notes against bills of exchange, after the method of the American Federal Reserve Bank. On the other hand, the Currency Committee recommend that the Bank of England should continue to work under its Charter, which meant the same experiences in the future as we had undergone in the past. Since the Act came into operation, in 1844, there had been 473 changes in the bank *rate*, in a large measure due to the division of the bank into two departments, resulting in a smaller reserve than if they had been consolidated. A small reserve was necessarily very sensitive. This reserve in the banking department was the pivot on which the price for money depended. It was clear that our manufacturers and merchants would be able to conduct their business more efficiently and more advantageously if they could be certain that there would be a more stable bank rate than in the past. This could only be accomplished by having a larger and less sensitive reserve and a higher ratio of reserve to liabilities. "Our traders," said Sir Edward, "are in competition with the traders of other countries, and if the banks of other countries work with fewer fluctuations in the bank rate than is the case in this country, our traders are placed at a disadvantage in comparison. We say, therefore, that the constitution of the bank, which is restricted in its working by the Bank Act of 1844, requires to be altered, and altered in such a way that the reserve will be larger, the ratio will be higher, and the fluctuations in the rate will be fewer." This could be effected by amalgamating the two departments of the bank.

Criticism of the Committee's Recommendations.

The objections of the Currency Committee to such an amalgamation were next answered, and other of their recommendations criticised. In particular, the Committee's statement that "the shortage of real capital cannot be met by the creation of fresh purchasing power in the form of bank advances to manufacturers under Government guarantee or otherwise" was severely handled. "We all admit," said Sir Edward, "that capital will be required to re-convert those concerns which have been used for the manufacture of munitions of war, and that large resources will be required to renew and bring into a state of efficiency machinery and plant which have been allowed to deteriorate. Large sums of money will also be required for the purchase of raw materials and the extensions of business. We all agree that it is necessary to increase our exports, but before we can do this the reconstruction of our

industries must take place. If the industries are not to look for accommodation to the bankers who have gathered up all the resources of the country, then the reconstruction and reconversion which we admit to be necessary cannot take place."

Did the Committee's dictum mean that our industries were not to seek accommodation from the banks for the purposes indicated? If they were to wait for the slowly accumulated profits of industry it appeared to him that our manufacturers would be left to languish.

What is "Cash?"

The Chairman dealt also with the proposal to put the 28½ millions of gold cover against currency notes in the Bank of England and to substitute notes therefor; with the proposed future issue of small Bank of England notes in substitution for the then outstanding currency notes; with the suggestion that banks should hold a line of Treasury bills and short-dated Government securities, which might be discounted at the bank in case of pressure—"in my opinion an unwise suggestion"—and with the recommendation that the Joint Stock Banks should adopt a common form of balance-sheet coupled with the suggestion that the item cash should include "balances with other banks" (respecting which he said "a balance with another bank is not cash, and can by no stretch of imagination be made so"). With regard to the last recommendation, Sir Edward pointed out the disastrous results of a similar policy in connection with the American crisis of 1907.

The Joint Stock Banks' Gold Reserves.

The last of the recommendations of the Currency Committee to be referred to by the Chairman was that the gold held by the Joint Stock Banks should be handed to the Bank of England to strengthen the reserve of the latter. If this were done, the position of the Joint Stock Banks would be weakened in the eyes of the public and of foreign bankers. It was their duty to protect the depositors with reserves of the very best quality; and to take away t e gold of the Joint Stock Banks, which had proved so useful during the war, was to take away from the depositors of the Joint Stock Banks the best reserve a bank could hold. The transfer of the gold from the Joint Stock Banks to the Bank of England would not improve the reserve of the latter, because the banks would demand notes for their gold, while the position of the former would be greatly depreciated. Instances were given from the war period shewing how advisable it is for the banks to hold gold.

Three Reserves to Protect the Exchanges.

An alternative method of protecting the foreign exchanges was indicated by Sir Edward, namely, that when in the course of time the currency notes have been reduced to 100 or 120 millions, 100 per cent. of gold should be accumulated and held as a reserve, thus making the currency note always convertible into gold. In addition the banks should contrive to hold gold in their reserves in increased amounts. We should thus have three reserves of gold; one reserve in the Bank of England, another held against the currency note, and a third reserve in the vaults of the Joint Stock Banks. The gold reserve against the currency notes might be used to strengthen the foreign exchanges when required. The gold which was held by the Joint Stock Banks, in addition to being a security for their deposits, might be used for a similar purpose, thus giving us three reserves acting as one reserve for the protection of the exchanges. He felt satisfied that this plan had only to be tried to prove successful.

The Property of the London Joint City and Midland Bank.

In the concluding part of his speech, Sir Edward Holden dealt more particularly with the figures of his own bank. He expressed complete satisfaction with the results of the amalgamation with the London Joint Stock Bank, and said that when the present issue of new shares was completed the capital account would be increased by £1,250,000 and the reserve fund by a similar amount. Allusion was made to the policy of issuing fully-paid shares to the shareholders in place of increasing the dividend. The bank was strengthened and not weakened by the transaction. The interests both of depositors and shareholders had been considered. Deposits had increased from £73,415,000 in 1910 to £334,883,000 in 1918, or, excluding the joint stock to £271,000,000; and he felt that the depositors would approve this method of strengthening the position of the bank, and, as regards the shareholders, they had an advantage in the issue of the new shares equivalent to an increase in dividend, and their interests were being permanently safeguarded.

Advances to Assist Trade.

The Chairman also commented on the high character of their assets. They had £63,756,000 in cash, of which eight millions was gold, their money at call and notice amounted to £65,800,000, and of their total investments, amounting to £61,600,000, no less than £57,500,000 was in different Government securities. The investments had been written down to market value, and were more likely to rise than to depreciate. The advances to customers, excluding advances on War Loan, amounted to £99,214,000, which shewed a percentage to the deposits of slightly under 30. Bank amalgamations had been criticised and complaints made by the industries that bankers did not accommodate their customers to the extent which they ought. He did not see how such complaints could be made against this bank, seeing that they were affording to the trade and industry of the country a sum of close on 100 millions sterling. Their percentage of loans to deposits was slightly down on last year, but this was due to the fact that the deposits had increased to such a very large extent. Excluding the figures of the Joint Stock Bank, deposits had increased no less than 50 millions on the amount in the previous year. In no sense could it be alleged that this bank had not done its duty to its borrowing customers, or that it had not assisted the trade and industry of the country to a legitimate and generous extent.

The Board's Conservative Policy.

After referring to the satisfactory results of the purchase of the Belfast Bank shares, the chairman pointed out that, although the past year's results of their own bank had been so good, it must be remembered that we were working in a period of high prices as well as of large profits, and it must not be assumed that the same profits would be made when rates fell. It was their duty, therefore, to make proper provision for the difficulties of the reconstruction period, and against any possible losses that might be made in spite of the greatest care. The profit and loss account was conservative in its allocations, and it might be thought that the dividend ought to have been increased. The Board did not consider that to be a wise policy. During the past three years they had paid £1,000,000 in salaries and bonus to the staff serving with the forces and in bonus to other members of the staff. Men were coming back from the war, and it became a question whether, instead of reducing the staff, it was not a favourable opportunity of sending this surplus abroad to work in foreign banks for educational purposes, of course paying their salaries. Both the directors and the management had the responsibility of preserving and increasing the strength and soundness of the bank, and they had firmly decided that they were bound to provide the depositors with the fullest security, and for this reason they had not increased the dividend. They were now starting on another year, and he thought there would be a great alteration in the figures. There was a great work ahead, and he asked for the sympathy and assistance of the shareholders, who might rely on the Board exercising the same watchfulness that had brought the bank to its present proud position. He moved the adoption of the report, which was unanimously carried.

The usual complimentary resolutions to the chairman, board of directors, managers and staff having been passed, the meeting terminated with a vote of thanks to Sir Edward Holden for his conduct in the chair that day.

London County Westminster and Parr's Bank.

The annual general meeting of the London County Westminster and Parr's Bank was held on Thursday at the head offices of the bank, Lothbury, E.C. Dr. Walter Leaf (Chairman) presided.

Dr. Leaf, in moving the adoption of the report and accounts, said that after the four last terrible years of war and death, of hope and wearing anxiety, they met that day at last in the hour of victory, long deferred but complete, and if we were worthy of ourselves, final, a victory which laid upon us the grave, the almost overwhelming task, of laying the foundations of a new epoch. Nothing, perhaps, had been more surprising than the steadiness, one might almost say the solidity, with which the City had taken the vast alternations, anxiety and hope, of defeat and victory, through which we have been passing. We have had neither financial panic nor financial boom; the varying phases of the war could hardly be recognized in the barometer of the Stock Exchange. The one great feature of the Money Market had been the success of the system of day-to-day borrowing; the firm determination with which, under the able leadership of the National War Savings Committee, sudden and transitory effort had been uplifted to the higher level of unremitting strain.

The Outlook.

In tracing the probable course of the Money Market, he shewed that in all probability there would be a gradual reversion to a lower scale of profits. They had to bear this in mind in the proposals before them that day. This was not a time for larger distributions, but for conservation of resources. They were offering in their proposals for allotment of new shares a bonus for the year, but at the same time the shareholders must guard themselves against raising any hope that this would be repeated in the future. Circumstances were such that it was clearly the policy of the bank to use the large balance in hand for strengthening and maintaining the position they had attained, and their aim was to broaden the basis of their business by further extensions at home and abroad as the best security for future dividends. Referring to the amalgamation with Parr's Bank, he said this had fulfilled their hopes entirely, and had proved a valuable assistance to both the businesses. They had arranged a further amalgamation with the Nottingham and Notts Bank, and having detailed the advantages of that fusion, he said the terms offered the shareholders of the acquired bank were such that, after full inquiry into the business, the directors of the London County could confidently recommend it to their shareholders. He then alluded to their home extension policy, to the money they intended to spend on bringing up to date many of the existing premises, the remainder of the £300,000 set aside for premises account going to the extension by new branches. As to their foreign extensions, he shewed the progress of their Spanish branches, referred to their banking programme in Belgium, and to the prosperity of the Paris bank. They had branches at Bordeaux, also at Lyons and Marseilles.

THE ULSTER BANK.

They would find in the balance-sheet of the Ulster Bank, he said, an ample justification of the terms they offered for the purchase of that institution, and he detailed the expansion in the business, which, he said, had been remarkable. The deposits of the Ulster Bank had grown during the fifteen months to 30th November last by no less than £5,000,000, from £12,877,000 to £17,892,000. The outcome of the fifteen months' working might be summarized thus:—They had received in dividend from the Ulster Bank, less tax, £96,000, while they were paying the shareholders in dividend on London County's own shares allotted to them £114,000, or £18,000 more than their own bank had received. On the other hand, they had not only put, out of the profits of the period, a sum of £20,000 to the superannuation fund, raising it to a point at which the interest would cover existing pensions, but they had added no less than £72,000 to the carry forward. This undivided profit which was at their disposal was enough not only to pay the deficit on the dividend, but to provide the interest on the cash which they gave in addition to the shares, with a handsome amount towards the reduction of the principal. At this rate they should see the whole of their money back in a few years.

CAPITAL INCREASE.

Proceeding, he said with all the openings for extended business in front of them they, like their chief competitors, had come to the conclusion that it was their duty to increase their capital. What that increase should be was a question of some difficulty. If they took the ratio of their capital to their deposits as a guide they had to remember that, while the deposits had grown with wonderful rapidity under the artificial stress of the war and the concomitant creation of new credit, they would almost certainly have to face a reduction in them when those artificial conditions came to an end, as they must in time. They did not, therefore, think it necessary to swell their capital in the proportion of a growth which they regarded as temporary. They were, therefore, asking the shareholders to add a comparatively moderate sum of a little over £1,400,000 to capital. They had also passed out of profits the very substantial addition of £600,000 to reserve, thus making a considerable provision for the guarantee of the dividend on the new capital and giving the bank a reserve in excess of its paid-up capital. Part of the issue would be made in the form of a bonus to the staff.

THE STAFF.

After a warm tribute to the services of the staff, to those who had served with the Colours, and to those who stayed behind to serve their country, he said that the bank had already devoted to the staff what was, in the aggregate and measured in money, a large sum. Payment to men with the Colours and the bonuses paid to the staff at home, permanent and temporary, cost them last year £361,000. For the current year the bonus already promised would exceed this whole amount. What they might still have to pay for men on active service they could not tell, but it was quite possible that the two together would amount to half a million. In addition to this they had been raising the salaries of their permanent staff on a much more liberal scale than usual. The Board fully recognized that the bonus was no more than adequate to meet the cost of living in face of the rise of prices. Dr. Leaf also explained the scheme for a special share bonus to staff of about 10 per cent. in recognition of their services. Further, the directors were suggesting that the shareholders should set aside the sum of £100,000 as a permanent war memorial for the benefit, in the first place, of the children of those who had fallen, and afterwards of the staff at large. Among the uses of the fund so set aside it would be seen there was a special reference to education. He showed that while the past system of educating their staff had produced officers who could hold their own with any men in England, yet it was not the most efficient system—it was wasteful of energy and wasteful of time. He would like to see a system of scholarships established which would enable the most promising and ambitious of their younger men to continue their education while still with the bank, and to this end a fund such as they had before them might powerfully contribute. Finally, the chairman said the problem which must needs give them the most anxiety was that of the future relations between the employers and the employed. The outlook was full of grave difficulties, but it could be met if faced with courage, calmness and a spirit of conciliation and mutual self-help such as enabled us to face the yet graver and more alarming prospect at the outbreak of the war. Let us be optimists, for it is the optimists who get things done. When they looked back on the history of the last four years they could lay claim on behalf of the British banking at large, and of their bank as standing in the first rank, to a solid, even a surprising, advance in strength, in width of view, in patriotic and unceasing efforts to meet the present and to face the future in a way which should not be unworthy of the traditions of British commerce and British finance.

The report was adopted, the resolution sanctioning the War Memorial Fund was passed, the retiring directors re-elected and auditors re-appointed.

Cordial votes of thanks to the chairman, directors, the general managers, and to the other officers and staff were unanimously passed.

Mr. Benjamin Burton, of Leigham Lodge, Streatham, S.W., and of Bank Chambers, Blackfriars, S.E., solicitor, left £100 each to the Salvation Army and the Church Army, left estate of gross value £65,786.

Law Students' Journal.

Calls to the Bar.

The following were called to the Bar on Monday night:—

LINCOLN'S INN.—F. C. Bune; F. S. Whinney; J. G. Jameson, of Balliol College, Oxford; R. F. Burnand, of Pembroke College, Oxford, M.A.; M. S. Shahani, of New College, Oxford, B.A.; C. A. Birtchnell, of London University; A. Carreras, of London University and of the University of Malta; E. O. Mousley, of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and of New Zealand University, LL.B.

INNER TEMPLE.—G. W. Ralston, M.A., Glasgow; B. J. Ellis, B.A., Camb.; I. Gluckstein, B.A., Camb.; H. S. Short, B.A., Camb.; C. N. Coad, M.A., Camb.; G. Howard, B.A., Oxon; H. F. Jolowicz, B.A., Camb.; W. H. Ehrhardt, M.A., Camb.; R. C. B. T. de Poix, B.A., Oxon; T. J. O'Connor, B.A., Oxon; J. Davies, M.A., Oxon; A. M. Trustram Eve, Oxon; S. M. Saleem, B.A., Oxon; Y. G. Gaekwad, B.A., Camb.; C. L. Adhiya; Sambhu Saran, B.A., Oxon; S. L. Elborne, M.B.E., M.A., A.I.C., Camb.; I. Majid, B.A., Camb.

MIDDLE TEMPLE.—J. H. Critchley; J. S. Rae; D. C. Lall, B.A., Oxon; R. J. Mules, R.I.B.A., F.R.G.S.; Lieut. J. L. Wright, Inns of Court O.T.C.; Lieut. E. H. Jones, M.A., Indian Army Reserve of Officers; Capt. C. Middleton, Middlesex Regiment; Major J. Cemlyn-Jones, 6th Royal Welsh Fusiliers; Lieut. Alban Musgrave Thomas, R.F.A.; H. E. Suffling; N. L. Deorankar, B.A.; P. W. Williams; R. K. Handoo, M.A., Edin.; F. E. Sugden, Capt. E. M. Fitz-Gerald, 5th Lancers, Barrister-at-Law (Ireland); C. A. Peters; J. Peace.

GRAY'S INN.—Sec. Lieut. H. K. Stein, R.E., Exhibitioner and B.A. (First Class Honours), Balliol College, Oxford, Holder of Inns of Court studentship, Council of Legal Education, Hilary, 1916, Holt Scholar, Gray's Inn, 1913; Sec. Lieut. R. R. Ludlow, D.C.L.I., B.A. (Honours), Balliol College, Oxford, LL.B.; H. Morris; A. K. Basu, B.A., LL.B. (non-coll.), Cambridge, B.Sc.; Lieut. G. H. M. Thompson, R.E., Deputy Assistant Director of Materials and Priority, Admiralty, B.A., Christ's College, Cambridge, B.A.; Lieut. H. W. A. Bodkin, B.A., Christ Church, Oxford; J. Peacock, LL.B. (Honours), University of London; Joseph Hume, Scholar in Jurisprudence, University College, London; H. K. Ayo; E. G. Stray, Deputy Clerk to the Twickenham U.D.C.; C. A. Stray, Assistant Clerk to the Heston and Isleworth U.D.C.; S. M. Gupta; H. S. E. Vanderpant; G. S. Saigal.

Obituary.

Mr. E. S. Fordham.

Mr. EDWARD SNOW FORDHAM, formerly a Metropolitan police magistrate, who died at his residence, Elbrook House, Ashwell, Herts, on 23th January, aged sixty-one years, was the eldest son of the late Edward King Fordham, J.P., D.L., of The Bury, Ashwell. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, taking his B.A. degree in 1880, and proceeding to M.A., LL.M., in 1883. He was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in November, 1883, and read in chambers with Sir Arthur Channell, practising on the Midland Circuit.

In 1898 Mr. Fordham was appointed a Metropolitan Police magistrate in the place of Mr. James Hannay, and sat at the North London Police Court, from which he was transferred in 1910 to West London, retiring in 1917. For many years Mr. Fordham had been Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Quarter Sessions, and was D.L. of Hertfordshire and J.P. in Hertfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Bedfordshire. He took a deep interest in local government, was a keen shot, and farmed about 1,500 acres. In 1880 he married the eldest daughter of the late T. Carr Jackson, F.R.C.S., and had three sons and two daughters.

Legal News.

Honours and Appointments.

The King has been pleased to approve of the Prime Minister's recommendation that the dignity of a peerage of the United Kingdom be conferred upon the Rt. Hon. Sir F. E. SMITH, Bt., K.C., M.P., on the occasion of his appointment to the Lord Chancellorship. It is understood that Sir Frederick Smith will take the title of Lord Birkenhead.

The King has been pleased also to approve of the Prime Minister's recommendation that the honour of knighthood be conferred upon PAUL OGDEN LAWRENCE, K.C., one of His Majesty's judges of the High Court of Justice.

Dr. HENRY BOND has been elected to the mastership of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, which has been vacant since the death of Mr. E. A. Beck, in April, 1916. Dr. Bond entered at Trinity Hall in 1873, and in 1875 gained the Members' Prize for an English essay. He was senior in the Law Tripos of 1876, Chancellor's Medallist for legal studies in 1877, and obtained a first class in the Historical Tripos of 1877. Appointed Lecturer in Law at Trinity College in 1886, he held that appointment for thirty years. In 1887 he was elected to a Fellowship at Trinity Hall, and became Law Lecturer there in the following year. He is a barrister-at-law of the Middle Temple, and married a daughter of the late Dr. E. S. Shuckburgh, Fellow of Emmanuel and sometime a master at Eton.

Changes in Partnerships.

Dissolution.

WEBSTER BUTCHER, PHILIP WEBSTER BUTCHER, and DOUGLAS HARRY BUTCHER, solicitors (Webster, Butcher, and Sons), 13, Bouverie-street, E.C., and Tooting, S.W. Dec. 31. The said Philip Webster Butcher and Douglas Harry Butcher will continue to carry on business at the above address. [*Gazette*, Jan. 28.

Information Required.

MISS LUCY MARY BEDFORD, Deceased.—Information is desired which may bring to light the existence of a Will of the deceased, which is believed to have been made between February, 1899, and 30th June, 1910, while residing at Courtney Lodge, Lennox-road, Southsea. Any trouble which may result in a will being found will be recognized. —Chas. G. Vincent, Solicitor, Ryde, Isle of Wight. 22nd January, 1919.

General.

Mr. Harold R. Le V. de Carteret, a barrister, of the Middle Temple, who lived at Kensington Park-gardens, was thrown out of a motor-car at Radlett on Sunday afternoon, and died the following morning from a fractured skull. He had been fishing at Wheathampstead with two men friends. They were making way for another car on the high bridge at Radlett, a very narrow and dangerous spot, where there have been several serious mishaps, when the accident happened. At the inquest a verdict of "Accidental death" was returned. Mr. de Carteret was forty-three years old. He was the son of Mr. J. T. de Carteret, Hanham Court, Gloucestershire.

"M. D. C.," in a letter to the *Times* (23th January), says:—Your article to-day on road control is timely. Highway law in England is in a fine state of confusion. A reference to the official index to the Statutes shows that the common law relating to highways is supplemented by forty-eight Acts of Parliament, beginning with an Act of 1523 (14 & 15 Hen. 8, c. 6) and ending with the Road Board Act of 1902. If these enactments were consolidated there would be some chance of knowing what the present law is, and the task of amending it would be much amplified. The Mother of Parliaments may have many virtues, but tidiness is not one of them.

At North London Police Court on 23rd January, says the *Times*, Rose Lane, nineteen, a servant, was charged on remand with stealing a Treasury note and jewellery to the value of £21 from her mistress. A woman doctor stated that the girl was mentally deficient, and suggested that she should be sent to an institution. Mr. Bingley remarked that before he took that step he should like to hear more of the family history, adding that for six months before he was appointed to the Bench he was a member of the Advisory Committee dealing with mental deficiency cases. There were said to be 30,000 of such cases, and it would be a matter of some magnitude if all these persons had to be provided for in institutions. He again remanded the girl.

At an influentially attended meeting at New College, Oxford, on Wednesday, 22nd January, it was unanimously resolved to found an Oxfordshire Records Society, the object of which will be to print and distribute to subscribers such documents relating to the county as have not been previously edited, with other materials relating to the history of the county, and to endeavour to give advice and assistance to custodians of historical records. The Duke of Marlborough was invited to become president, and among those who have already joined the society are:—The Vice-Chancellor of the University, Lord Cumoys, the Dean of Carlisle, the Dean of Christ Church, Lord Effingham, Lord Hambleden, Lord Harcourt, Lord Jersey, Bodley's Librarian, Lord Morton, Sir William Osler, the Bishop of Oxford, Lord Phillimore, Lord Saye and Sele, and Lord Valentia.

Mr. Thomas Russell, President of the Incorporated Society of Advertisement Consultants, delivered on the night of 23rd January, at the London School of Economics and Political Science, the first of a course of six lectures on Commercial Advertising. He said that modern advertising dated from the discovery that the only kind of advertising which paid was honest advertising. Contrary to popular belief, the great movement in favour of truthful and straightforward advertising had begun in America, where a law, known as the Printers' Ink Statute, had been passed in thirty-nine States, penalizing exaggeration. Advertising cost £100,000,000 a year in this country, but this expenditure had economic justification; without advertising many useful inventions could not be introduced at all, and the increased output of factories, made possible by advertising, enabled domestic commodities to be sold more cheaply than if the sale were supported in any other way. The lectures will be continued on Thursday evenings at seven.

Messrs. Cammell, Laird & Co., shipbuilders, says the *Times*, were summoned at Birkenhead on 24th January for having unlawfully occupied a "new building" as a dwelling-house before it was certified as fit for human habitation. The proceedings were instituted under a local Act of 1881, which provides that the conversion into more than one dwelling-house of a building which was originally built as one dwelling-house only shall be considered to be the erection of a new building. The defendants admitted that they had converted two large houses into flats, but contended that the building stood exactly as built before 1881. Therefore no certificate was needed. The flats had a common entrance and a common staircase. They were under one roof, and comprised one building. Prosecuting counsel argued that each flat was a separate dwelling-house. Each set of rooms required its own sanitary arrangements, and should be certified fit for human habitation before being let. The magistrates found the case made out, and fined defendants £1, promising to state a case for the defendants, who gave notice of appeal to the higher Courts.

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.		Emergency Rota.	Appeal Court No. 1.	Mr. Justice Eve	Mr. Justice Sargant.
Monday..	Feb. 3	Mr. Jolly	Mr. Farmer	Mr. Leach	Mr. Church
Tuesday	4	Synge	Jolly	Church	Farmer
Wednesday ..	5	Bloxam	Synge	Farmer	Jolly
Thursday	6	Borrer	Bloxam	Jolly	Synge
Friday	7	Goldschmidt	Borrer	Synge	Bloxam
Saturday	8	Leach	Goldschmidt	Bloxam	Borrer

Date.		Mr. Justice Astbury	Mr. Justice Younger.	Mr. Justice Peterson.	Mr. Justice P. O. Lawrence.
Monday..	Feb. 3	Mr. Goldschmidt	Mr. Borrer	Mr. Bloxam	Mr. Synge
Tuesday	4	Leach	Goldschmidt	Borrer	Bloxam
Wednesday ..	5	Church	Leach	Goldschmidt	Borrer
Thursday	6	Farmer	Church	Leach	Goldschmidt
Friday	7	Jolly	Farmer	Church	Leach
Saturday	8	Synge	Jolly	Farmer	Church

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Jan. 17.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

AZULAY SYNDICATE, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb. 17, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Barton, Abbey rd, Park Royal, Willesden, liquidator.

CARL FUNTKAMP, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before March 3, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick Walker Holland, 26, Pall Mall, Manchester, liquidator.

PARRICLESS RUBBER PRODUCTS, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 17, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Barton, Abbey rd, Park Royal, Willesden, liquidator.

IRIS CYCLE CO, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Geoffrey Bostock, 21, Ironmonger la, liquidator.

LAW INTEGRITY INSURANCE CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb. 18, to send in their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Messrs. Jackson & Hesketh, 51, North John st, Liverpool, liquidators.

MORTON GIBSON, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thos. Hayes, East Parade, Leeds, and Leslie E. Brown, 20, East Parade, Leeds, joint liquidators.

NERO ENGINE CO, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to Geoffrey Bostock, 21, Ironmonger la, liquidator.

NORTHCOTE SHIPPING CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to W. H. Armstrong, 16, Dean st, Newcastle on Tyne, liquidator.

PITSMOOR LAUNDRY AND CARPET BEATING CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Walter Foulston, 15, Leopold st, Sheffield, liquidator.

QUEEN'S PARK HOTEL CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Newman Bailey, 3, Portland st, Southampton, liquidator.

ZERMATT STEAMSHIP CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to William Henry Turner, 8 and 9, Great St. Helens, liquidator.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Jan. 21.

CROYDON AVIATION & ENGINEERING CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 22, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to H. J. de C. Moore, 2, Gresham bldgs, liquidator.

DITTON VITRIOL CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to James Henry Kneale, 17A, South Castle st, Liverpool, liquidator.

THOMAS GIBSON & CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Adolphus Augustus Beddall Walford, Finkle chmbrs, Stockton on Tees, liquidator.

WM. HODGSON & CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Duncan Gilmour, Highbury, Sandygate, Sheffield, liquidator.

PHILETTA HOTEL, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 3, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Robert Noble, Estate Agent, Percy av, Kingsgate on Sea, liquidator.

POLISHES, LTD. (IN LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 4, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to John Hamilton Hodson, 69, Basinghall st, liquidator.

WILLIAM SHARPE, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to Fredc. Wm. Davis, F.C.A., 95-97, Finsbury pvmt, liquidator.

WYATT, JAMES, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 21, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederic William Davis, 95/97, Finsbury pvmt, liquidator.

Creditors Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Jan. 24.

ADAMS, GEORGE RICHARD, Southampton, Paper Dealer. Feb 24 Lomer, Grierson & Lester, Southampton

ALLISON, MARY DEANE, Louth Feb 24 Allisons & Staniland, Louth

ALLISON, THOMAS FALKNER, Louth Feb 24 Allisons & Staniland, Louth

ANGRAVE, ELIZA JANE, Highgate March 15 Sami. Price & Sons, Worcester House, Walbrook

APPLEBY, MAUDE, Greatham, Durham. March 1. Turnbull & Tilly, West Hartlepool.

BROCKLESBY, THOMAS, Doncaster, Farm Bailiff. March 1. Frank Allen, Doncaster.

BURGER, FRANZ, Wokingham. Feb. 26. Gedge, Fiske & Gedge, 10, Norfolk st.

CAMP, ARTHUR GIFFORD, Ilfracombe, Wine Merchant. Feb. 28. C. E. Roberts Barnstaple, Chester.

CARPENTER, Rt. Rev. Bishop WILLIAM BOYD, Little Cloisters, Westminster. March 1. Hargrove & Co., 16, Victoria st.

CASH, WILLIAM HOLLAND, Kelsall, Chester. March 5. J. & E. Whitworth, Manchester.

CHURCHWARD, ANTOINETTE JULIA, Guissano, Italy. Feb. 27. George C. Carter & Co., 3, Arundel st.

COBB, LOUISA KATHERINE, Worle, nr. Weston-super-Mare. Feb. 28. Brighten & Lemon, 1, Crutched friars.

CORNISH, Rev. WILLIAM FLOYER, Steepleton, Dorset. March 1. Frank W. Faulkner, 7, Chandos st.

COVINGTON, JOSEPH EDWARD, Milman rd., Queen's Park, Engineer. Feb. 28. H. H. Wells & Sons, 17, Paternoster row.

COVERLEY, CHARLES HENRY, Oporto, Portugal. March 4. Blachford, Norton & Smith. 15, Walbrook.

COX, ELIZABETH CHARLOTTE, Bridgwater, Feb. 28. Barham & Watson, Bridgwater.

DAVIS, SAMUEL BRASMERE, St. Kilda, Victoria, Australia. Feb. 28. Burton, Yeates & Hart, 23, Surrey st.

DEWELL, GEORGE, Wellington rd., Forest Gate, House Painter. Feb. 20. Forbes & Son, 19, Mark ln.

DYSON, JOSHUA, Leeds. Feb. 20. Alfred Hutley, Leeds.

EVANS, BERTRAM PROUTE, Ripon, Yorks., Farmer. Feb. 28. Peckover, Scriven & Co., Leeds.

FIRBY, JOHN THOMAS, Thornton Watlass, nr. Bedale, Yorks., Farmer. March 15. Edmundson & Gowland, Masham, Yorks.

FIRTH, THOMAS WILLIAMS STAPLES, Upper Tulse Hill, Solicitor. Feb. 24. Firth & Co., 5, Chancery ln.

FREDERICKS, GEORGE, Seventh av., Manor Park. Feb. 20. Forbes & Son, 19, Mark ln.

GARRARD, PERCY, Hayes, Kent. Feb. 23. Shaw & Son, 88, London st., Greenwich.

GOSDEN, HENRY, Folkestone. Feb. 28. W. B. Bradley & Hulme, Folkestone.

GODDARD, ELIZABETH, Darlington. Feb. 22. J. F. Latimer, Darlington.

GOUACHE, RENE CHARLES EMIL, Paris. March 11. Parker, Garrett & Co., St. Michael's Rectory, Cornhill.

HALL, HENRY ERNST, Iver Heath, Buckingham. March 1. Bridges, Sawtell & Co., 23, Red Lion sq.

HAMILTON, WILLIAM, Wanstead, Essex. March 1. Nelson Crowther, 10, Lincoln's inn fields.

HARDING, CHARLES, Tetbury, Gloucester. March 8. Abbot, Pope & Abbot, Bristol.

HARDING, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Exeter. Feb. 18. James & Snow, Exeter.

HARRIS, ANN, Swansea. Feb. 25. Viner, Leeder & Morris, Swansea.

HARRIS, HANNAH, Hales Owen, Worcester. March 1. Homfray & Goodman, Hales Owen.

HARVEY, GEORGE, Hampstead. Feb. 20. Snow, Fox & Higginson, 7, Great St. Thomas Apostle.

HEBDEN, WILLIAM CARR, Halifax, Manufacturing Chemist. March 1. Storey, Willans & Storey, Halifax

HODGES, HENRY, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Accountant. Feb. 23. John F. Stewart, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

HOLLIS, EMILY, Bell st., Edgware rd. Feb. 28. Culross & Co., 13, Old Cavendish st.

HUMPHREYS, EDWARD, Abertridwr, Glam., Chemist. March 1. T. Millward, Pentre, Glam.

JACKSON, THOMAS, Island of St. Helena, Merchant. March 8. Travers-Smith, Braithwaite & Co., 4, Throgmorton av.

JENKINS, FRANCIS THOMAS, Gelynog Villa, nr. Pontypridd, Farm Bailiff. Feb. 28. J. S. Davies, Pontypridd.

JOHN, THOMAS, Swansea. Feb. 25. Viner, Leeder & Morris, Swansea.

JOHNSTON, JAMES, SHANGHAI. March 21. Sydney James, 2, New ct., Carey st.

JONES, GEORGE ARTHUR, Malvern Wells. Feb. 22. A. J. Glover, Wednesbury.

JONES, RICHARD, Bangor. March 8. Carter, Vincent & Co., Bangor.

JONES, THOMAS RICHARD, Aberystwyth. Feb. 28. Joseph Davies & Son, Aberystwyth.

KNAPP, WILLIAM HENRY, Filton, Gloucester. Feb. 22. Bolton & Davidson, Bristol.

LYNE, EDGAR, the younger, Christchurch rd., Streatham. March 1. Proudfoot & Chaplin, 5, Verulam bldgs.

MACDONALD, RODERICK, Manchester. March 4. Slater, Heelis & Co., Manchester.

MCPHERSON, ANNIE, Glaxton gr., Hammersmith. Feb. 7. J. Kennett Brown, Ealing.

MOLES, JAMES VANSTONE, Cheltenham. Feb. 17. Steel, Millard & Broom, Cheltenham.

MORTON, WILLIAM, Royton, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. Feb. 28. Ernest C. Marland, Oldham.

MOYLE, MICHAEL, Plumstead. March 12. Charles Watkins, 15, Basinghall st.

MYER, GRENVILLE, Sutherland av. March 1. Adler & Perowne, 46 and 47, London Wall.

NEVILLE, VIOLET ADELAIDE, Crystal Palace rd., Dulwich. Feb. 24. Chas. O. Green, 18, Walbrook.

NISBET, AGNES, Eastbourne. Feb. 22. Nisbet, Daw & Nisbet, 35, Lincoln's inn fields.

NORTON, HENRY CHARLES, Langport, Somerset, Grocer. March 8. Louch, Son & Goode, Langport.

OCCLESTON, SAMUEL, Bexley Heath, Kent. March 1. H. P. Russell, Bexley Heath.

PATTERSON, CHARLES COX, Calcutta, India. April 25. Rehder & Higgs, 20, Mincing ln.

PATTERSON, LESSELS MALCOLM, Howitt rd, Belsize pk. April 25. Rehder & Higgs, 20, Mincing ln.

PEARCY, THOMAS HENRY, Uffculme, Devon, Licensed Victualler. Feb. 14. Clyde S. Mossop, Ottery St. Mary, Devon.

PINKERTON, ROBERT, South Norwood. March 8. Marshall & Liddle, Croydon.

PYECROFT, WILLIAM HENRY, Wakefield. Feb. 28. Cruesemann & Rouse, 85, Gracechurch st.

RAWSON, RICHARD HAMILTON, Bolney, Sussex, M.P. Feb. 28. Corbould, Rigby & Co., 1, Henrietta st., Cavendish sq.

RAYNER, JOHN EDWARD, Oxton, Birkenhead, Colliery Proprietor. March 10. Alsop, Stevens, Crooks & Co., Liverpool.

RUSHOUT, CECILIA OLIVIA ANNE, Portman st., Marylebone. March 25. Peacock & Goddard, 3, South sq., Gray's inn.

SIBLEY, MARY JANE, Denton, Lancs. Feb. 24. H. Bostock, Hyde.

SAUNDERS, MARGARET ELIZABETH, Staines, Middlx. March 1. Radford & Frankland, 27, Chancery ln.

SINCLAIR, DONALD, Canterbury rd., Old Kent rd., Licensed Victualler. March 3. Henry I. Sydney, 3, Renfrew rd., Lambeth.

SPATAFY, MARIE, Acton. Feb. 26. Soames, Edwards & Jones, Lennox House, Norfolk st.

STUBINGTON, JEREMIAH SAMUEL, Bournemouth. March 20. Edgcombe, Cole & Hellyer, Southsea.

TAYLOR, ARTHUR JAMES, Strensham, Worcester. March 1. Smythe, Etches & Jackson, Birmingham.

TODD, JOHN, Egremont, Cheshire. Feb. 21. Evans, Lockett & Co., Liverpool.

TRAFFORD, GEOFFREY THOMAS, Hove, Sussex. March 1. Charles Warner & Kirby, Winchester.

WATKIN, GEORGE, Leeds. March 15. Nelson, Eddisons & Lupton, Leeds.

WATSON, ANN, Haltwhistle. Feb. 11. Blackburn & Main, Haltwhistle.

WHEADON, CATHERINE, Dinnington, Somerset. Feb. 22. R. T. Walter, Ilminster.

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Jan. 10.

ADJUDICATIONS.

HAYMAN, CHARLES EDWARD, Holbeach, Lincs, Tailor. King's Lynn. Pet. Jan. 3. Ord. Jan. 3.

TAYLOR, ALFRED, Southport, Engineer. Liverpool. Pet. Nov. 30. Ord. Jan. 6.

WADE, FREDERICK, Scarning, Norfolk, Farmer. Norwich. Pet. Jan. 7. Ord. Jan. 7.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Jan. 14.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

DEAN, JOSEPH, Horsforth, nr. Leeds, Dyer. Leeds. Pet. Jan. 8. Ord. Jan. 8.

FORREST, RALPH LEOPOLD CHRISTOPHER, Northampton, Veterinary Surgeon. Northampton. Pet. Jan. 10. Ord. Jan. 10.

MAYFIELD, CHARLES, Clifton, Bristol, Electrical Engineer. Bristol. Pet. Dec. 18. Ord. Jan. 10.

MEEKE, WILLIAM, Weymouth st., Portland pl., Dental Surgeon. High Court. Pet. Jan. 11. Ord. Jan. 11.

PAYNE THOMAS ALFRED, Worcester, Builder. Worcester. Pet. Jan. 6. Ord. Jan. 6.

FIRST MEETINGS.

CLOUDSDALE, SARAH ELIZABETH, Barrow-in-Furness. Jan. 24 at 11.15. Off. Rec., 16, Cornwallis st., Barrow-in-Furness.

MEEKE, WILLIAM, Weymouth st., Portland pl., Dental Surgeon. Jan. 23 at 12, Bankruptcy bldgs., Carey st.

PAYNE, THOMAS ALFRED, Worcester, Builder. Jan. 2[illegible] at 12. Off. Rec., 11, Copenhagen st., Worcester.

ROBERTS, THOMAS, Ramsgate, Newsagent. Jan. 22 at 11.30. Off. Rec., 68a, Castle st., Canterbury.

UNDERWOOD, GEORGE DOUGLAS, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Explosive Agent. Jan. 23 at 2.30. Off. Rec., 8, Manor pl., Sunderland.

ADJUDICATIONS.

DEAN, JOSEPH, Horsforth, nr. Leeds, Dyer. Leeds. Pet. Jan. 8. Ord. Jan. 8.

FORREST, RALPH LEOPOLD CHRISTOPHER, Northampton, Veterinary Surgeon. Northampton. Pet. Jan. 10. Ord. Jan. 11.

GATE, AMBROSE, Wareham, Dorset. Poole. Pet. Sept. 26. Ord. Jan. 10.

LOCKWOOD, KENYON, Huddersfield, Stuff Merchant. Huddersfield. Pet. Dec. 5. Ord. Jan. 7.

MEEKE, WILLIAM, Weymouth st., Portland pl., Dental Surgeon. High Court. Pet. Jan. 11. Ord. Jan. 11

PAYNE, THOMAS ALFRED, Worcester, Builder. Worcester. Pet. Jan. 6. Ord. Jan. 6.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Jan. 17.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALVEY, JOHN, Burton Joyce, Nottinghamshire, Hosiery Manufacturer. Nottingham. Pet. Jan. 14. Ord Jan. 14.

BROWN, PERCY BOURNE, Half Moon st., Piccadilly. High Court. Pet. Nov. 9. Ord. Jan. 14.

DAY, JOHN, Hucknall Torkard, Nottinghamshire, Colliery Horsekeeper. Nottingham. Pet. Jan. 13 Ord. Jan. 13.

HALL, HARRY JOHN, Smethwick, staffs., Commercial Clerk. West Bromwich. Pet. Jan. 14. Ord. Jan. 14.

ODDY, WALTER, Addle st., Woollen Merchant. High Court. Pet. Nov. 20. Ord. Jan. 15.

WARD, CHARLES THOMAS, Birmingham, Grocer. Birmingham. Pet. Dec. 4. Ord. Jan. 10.

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Ty Croes, Anglesey, Grocer. Bangor. Pet. Jan. 11. Ord. Jan. 11.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BROWN, PERCY BOURNE, Half Moon st., Piccadilly. Jan. 28 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs., Carey st.

HAYMAN, CHARLES EDWARD, Holbeach, Lincs, Tailor. Feb. 6 at 12. Court House, King's Lynn.

ODDY, WALTER, Addle st., Woollen Merchant. Jan. 2[illegible] at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs., Carey st.

ADJUDICATIONS.

DAY, JOHN, Hucknall Torkard, Nottinghamshire, Colliery Horsekeeper. Nottingham. Pet. Jan. 13 Ord Jan. 13.

HALL, HARRY JOHN, Smethwick, Staffs, Commercial Clerk. West Bromwich. Pet. Jan. 14. Ord Jan. 14.

JARVIS, VICTOR REGINALD, Romford, Essex. Worcester. Pet. Sept. 16. Ord. Jan. 4.

MAYFIELD, CHARLES, Bristol, Electrical Engineer. Bristol. Pet. Dec. 13. Ord. Jan. 15.

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Ty Croes, Anglesey, Grocer. Bangor Pet. Jan. 11. Ord. Jan. 11.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Jan. 21.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

HARLAND, HARRY, Hartlepool, Durham, Hairdresser. Sunderland. Pet. Jan. 16. Ord. Jan. 16.

HEBD, WILLIAM, Mansfield, Notts, Commission Agent. Nottingham. Pet. Dec. 12. Ord. Jan. 16.

LEIGHTON, Major FREDERICK, Queen Victoria st., Director. High Court. Pet. Nov. 16. Ord Jan. 15.

FIRST MEETINGS.

DEAN, JOSEPH, Leeds, Dyer. Jan. 29 at 11.30. Off Rec., 24, Bond st., Leeds.

LEIGHTON, Major FREDERICK, Queen Victoria st., Director. Jan. 30 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs., Carey st.

WADE, FREDERICK, Scarning, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb. 1 at 12.30 Off. Rec., 8, Upper King st., Norwich.

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Ty Croes, Anglesey, Grocer. Jan. 29 at 12. Crypt chmbrs., Eastgate row, Chester.

ADJUDICATIONS.

BEACH, HERBERT JAMES, Westerham, Kent. Tunbridge Wells. Pet. Nov. 4. Ord. Jan. 17.

HARLAND, HARRY, Hartlepool, Durham, Hairdresser. Sunderland, Pet. Jan. 16. Ord. Jan. 16.

PANTOJA, JOCELEYNO DE CAMPOS, Liverpool. Liverpool. Pet. Oct. 19. Ord. Jan. 17.

TOPER, MEYER, Crutched Friars, General Produce Merchant. High Court. Pet. Jan. 4. Ord. Jan. 16.

SAWYER, FARRINGTON, Kingston-on-Thames. High Court. Pet. July 27, 1917. Ord. Jan. 16.

SLATER, GERALD EDMUND, Bournemouth. Poole. Pet. Nov. 4. Ord. Jan. 17.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Jan. 24.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

COPE, E. B. K., Weymouth. York. Pet. Dec. 30. Ord. Jan. 20.

SCHLOSSBERG, CHARLES, Bream, near Lydney, Glous., General Draper. Newport, Mon. Pet. Jan. 22. Ord. Jan. 22.

VICKERY, GEORGE, Gayton rd., Harrow. High Court. Pet. Dec. 23. Ord. Jan. 20.

WATERHOUSE, THOMAS, Bideford, Devon, Licensed Victualler. Barnstaple. Pet. Jan. 3. Ord. Jan. 20.

FIRST MEETINGS.

DAY, JOHN, Hucknall Torkard, Notts. Feb. 1 at 11. Off. Rec., 4, Castle pl., Nottingham.

HALL, HARRY JOHN, Smethwick, Commercial Clerk. Jan. 31 at 11.30. Off. Rec., Ruskin chmbrs., 191, Corporation st., Birmingham.

HARLAND, HARRY Hartlepool, Hairdresser. Feb. 4 at 3.30. Off. Rec., 8, Manor pl., Sunderland.

VICKERY, GEORGE, Gayton rd., Harrow. Feb. 5 at 12. Bankruptcy buldgs., Carey st.

YOUELL, R. St. J., Wood Green. Feb. 4 at 11. 14, Bedford row.

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of the 7th January.

REID, THOMAS CURWEN, Elgin-avenue, Maida Vale (as previously gazetted).

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALVEY, JOHN, Burton Joyce, Notts., Silk Hosiery Manufacturer. Nottingham. Pet. Jan. 14. Ord. Jan. 21.

BROWN, PERCY BOURNE, Half Moon st., Piccadilly. High Court. Pet. Nov. 9. Ord. Jan. 21.

SCHLOSSBERG, CHARLES, Bream, near Lydney, Glos., General Draper. Newport, Mon. Pet. Jan. 22. Ord. Jan. 22.

WATERHOUSE, THOMAS, Bideford, Devon, Licensed Victualler. Barnstaple. Pet. Jan. 3. Ord. Jan. 24.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Jan. 28.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADLER, WILLIAM HENRY, Gloucester cres., Regent's Park. High Court. Pet. Jan. 24. Ord. Jan. 24.

APPLEBY, THOMAS, Middlesbrough, Steelworker. Middlesbrough. Pet. Jan. 23. Ord. Jan. 23.

BOON, THOMAS, Soloa rd., Brixton, House Furnisher. High Court. Pet. Jan. 1. Ord. Jan. 24.

FAST, JACOB, Burton rd., Kilburn, Diamond Dealer. High Court. Pet. Dec. 19. Ord. Jan. 14

HARDY, SAMUEL, Hognaston, Derby, Timber Merchant. Derby. Pet. Jan. 25. Ord. Jan. 25.

MARKS, FRANK ROBERT FREDERICK, Hatton Garden, Diamond Broker. High Court. Pet. Jan. 24. Ord. Jan. 24.

SPROSTON, SAMUEL (JUNIOR), Nantwich, Cheshire. High Court. Pet. Dec. 12. Ord. Jan. 23.

THOMSON, KENNETH JOHN GORDON, Barrow-in-Furness, Fitter. Barrow-in-Furness. Pet. Jan. 22. Ord. Jan. 22.

WALLINGTON, EDITH SARAH, Cambridge. Cambridge. Pet. Jan. 9. Ord. Jan. 22.

WILLIAMS, ARTHUR PRICE, Llanrwst, Labourer. Portmadoc. Pet. Jan. 23. Ord. Jan. 23.